

The Slavic and East European Journal

Summer 1960

New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII) No. 2

**Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS
OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES**

AATSEEL OFFICERS, 1960

I. National Officers

President: Leon Twarog, Boston Univ.

Vice Presidents: Deming Brown, Univ. of Michigan

Albert Parry, Colgate Univ.

Francis J. Whitfield, Univ. of California
(Berkeley)

Executive Secretary-Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne
State Univ.

N. F. M. L. T. A. Delegate: J. T. Shaw (1960-63)

Executive Council: the above-listed Officers, plus
Claude P. Lemieux, U. S. Naval Academy
Zbigniew Folejewski, Univ. of Wisconsin
(the two most recent past Presidents)

II. Chapter Officers

California Chapter

President: Ludmilla A. Patrick, Univ. of California
(Berkeley)

Vice President: Jack Posin, Stanford Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: Richard W. Leland, Co-ordinator
AATSEEL (Calif.), Oakland
Public Schools

Connecticut Chapter

President: Kyra Bostroem, Middlebury

Vice President: Richard Burgi, Yale Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: William Mara, Stamford High School

District of Columbia Chapter

President: Claude P. Lemieux, U. S. Naval Academy

Secretary: Harry R. Keller, U. S. Naval Academy

Florida Chapter

President: Mrs. Eva Friedl, Univ. of Miami

Vice Presidents: Mrs. Santa Riegler, Manatee Junior Coll.
Mrs. Grace Dupre Brown, Miami Beach
Senior High School

Secretary: Michael A. Negrich, North Miami Jackson
High School

Treasurer: Joseph A. Tucker, Miami Beach Senior High
School

Indiana Chapter

President: J. T. Shaw, Indiana Univ.

Vice President: Catherine Hughes, FL Teacher-Co-
ordinator, Gary High Schools

Secretary-Treasurer: George F. Roe, Speedway High
School

Massachusetts Chapter

President: Irwin Weil, Brandeis Univ.

Secretary-Treasurer: Eleanor Korzeniewska, Emmanuel
Coll.

(continued on inside back cover)

The Slavic and East European Journal

New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII), No. 2

Summer 1960

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|----------------------|-----|
| Doktor <i>Živago</i> and the Living Tradition | Robert L. Jackson | 103 |
| Young Lev Tolstoj's Acquaintance with Sterne's <u>Sermons</u> and Griffith's <u>The Koran</u> | Peter Rudy | 119 |
| In the Stinking City: Dostoevskij's <u>Crime and Punishment</u> | F. D. Reeve | 127 |
| "The Fatalist" as a Keystone of <u>A Hero of Our Times</u> | John Mersereau, Jr. | 137 |
| Form and Style in the Letters of Aleksandr Puškin | J. T. Shaw | 147 |
| Russian Language Offerings in U.S. Secondary Schools, Feb. 1960 | Ilo Remer | 158 |
| REVIEWS | | |
| Andrey Biely, <u>St. Petersburg</u> , tr. John Cournos | Oleg A. Maslenikov | 166 |
| Vsevolod Setschkareff, <u>N. S. Leskov: Sein Leben und sein Werk</u> | George Ivask | 167 |
| Avrahm Yarmolinsky, <u>Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age</u> | Ralph E. Matlaw | 169 |
| Natalie Duddington and Nadejda Gorodetzky, <u>Lev Tolstoy Selections</u> | Walter C. Jaskievicz | 170 |
| Ronald Hingley, ed., <u>Soviet Prose: A Reader</u> | Edward J. Brown | 171 |
| F. M. Borrás and R. F. Christian, <u>Russian Syntax: Aspects of Modern Russian Syntax and Vocabulary</u> | John F. Beebe | 172 |
| Hildegard Striedter-Temps, <u>Deutsche Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen</u> | Alexander W. Wainman | 175 |
| Bernard Beiger et al., <u>Peoples and Languages of the Caucasus: A Synopsis</u> . . . | David Djaparidze | 176 |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
| Robert F. Byrnes, ed., <u>The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana</u> | Stephen A. Fischer-Galati | 177 |
| Laurence Schmeckebier, <u>Ivan Meštrović: Sculptor and Patriot</u> | Ante Kadić | 178 |
| Serge A. Zenkovsky, <u>Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia</u> | Ivar Spector | 180 |
| Ul. Hlybinny, <u>Vierzig Jahre weissruthenischer Kultur unter den Sowjets</u> | Anthony Adamovich | 181 |
| Vilho Niitemaa, <u>Baltian historia</u> | C. Leonard Lundin | 183 |
| Alfred E. Senn, <u>The Emergence of Modern Lithuania</u> | Emanuel Nodel | 185 |
| Frank Gibney, <u>The Frozen Revolution: A Study in Communist Decay</u> , and S. L. Shneiderman, <u>The Warsaw Heresy</u> | Piotr S. Wandycz | 186 |
| William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki, <u>The Polish Peasant in Europe and America</u> | Peter Brock | 187 |
| Brief Notices | | 189 |
| Books Received | | 194 |
| NEWS AND NOTES | | 197 |

Editor

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University, Bloomington

Associate Editors

Morton Benson
Ohio University, Athens
Edward Stankiewicz
Indiana University, Bloomington
Walter Vickery
Indiana University, Bloomington

Review Editor

Felix J. Oinas
Indiana University, Bloomington

Editorial Committee

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| Victor Erlich | J. B. Rudnyćkyj |
| Zbigniew Folejewski | Anthony Salys |
| William E. Harkins | Thomas A. Sebeok |
| The Rev. Walter C. Jaskiewicz, S. J. | Gleb Struve |
| Claude P. Lemieux | Nicholas Vakar |
| Horace Lunt | René Wellek |
| Oleg A. Maslenikov | |

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Russian Texts from PITMAN

Workbook for Basic Russian

By Mischa Fayer

To supplement Pitman's widely known first-year Russian grammar for high school classes. Each Workbook Unit is correlated with the material in the corresponding unit in the text, thus providing graded content for testing student's mastery of vocabulary and grammar. There are abundant exercises based on each rule of grammar in the Unit, as well as additional drills for further application of difficult grammatical principles. In the first Unit, ruled areas are provided so that students may practice forming both individual letters and words in correct outlines and proportions. Pages are punched and perforated for easy removal of any sheet for reference or corrections and for transfer to student's notebook. Upon adoption, a Key to the Workbook will be provided at no extra cost. Approximately 160 pages. *In press.*

Modern Russian Reader for Intermediate Classes

By Lila Pargment

New second edition. For the student who has had a minimum of two semesters' study in Russian and has a basic vocabulary and knowledge of Russian grammar. The *Reader* contains twenty-one prose works selected from modern authors, chosen to illustrate contemporary idiomatic Russian, and unchanged as much as possible. Difficult constructions are explained in footnotes, and direct-method exercises are found at the back of the book. \$3.50

Advanced Conversational Russian

By Nicholas Maltzoff

Designed for advanced conversational classes. There are ten conversational lessons and five debates. Each conversational lesson is supplemented by a vocabulary and a list of assignments. *In press.*

Pattern Drills in Russian

By Nicholas Maltzoff

Contains a series of oral drills involving characteristic Russian constructions, the use of the cases, and common verbs in both aspects, and in the present, past, and future. \$1.25

Tests for Simplified Russian Grammar

A series of eight four-page objective tests covering the subject matter in *Simplified Russian Grammar*. *In press.*

Write for your complete catalogue

2 West 45th Street, New York 36

PITMAN The First Name in Russian Textbooks

A Wide Choice of Textbooks—Teaching Aids

for study of RUSSIAN by non-Russian students regularly used
in middle school and colleges in the USSR

**LATEST EDITIONS of ENGLISH-RUSSIAN and RUSSIAN-ENGLISH
DICTIONARIES (new orthography)**

GEOGRAPHICAL ATLASES and MAPS

**Inexpensive editions of Russian CLASSIC WORKS used by most
American schools for students' reading assignments**

TALKING PHONOGRAPH RECORDS
acts from plays — monologues

Excellent for students' practice study in pronunciation

Ask for our TX 60 Catalogue

Four Continent Book Corp.

822 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Phone: GR 3-2018

MOUTON & CO. • PUBLISHERS • THE HAGUE (The Netherlands)

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

1. Eng-Liedmeier, A.M. van der: **SOVIET LITERARY CHARACTERS.**
An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose,
1917-1953. 176 pp. Cloth. \$4.50
2. Durnovo, N.: **OCHERK ISTORII RUSSKOGO JAZYKA.** (Photo-
mechanic Reprint) 384 pp. Cloth. \$6.50
3. Donchin, G.: **THE INFLUENCE OF FRENCH SYMBOLISM ON
RUSSIAN POETRY.** 242 pp. 7 ills. Cloth. \$6.50
4. Milada Součková: **THE CZECH ROMANTICS.** 168 pp. Cloth. \$4.00
5. Schooneveld, C. H. van: **A SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE OLD
RUSSIAN PRETERITE SYSTEM.** 183 pp. Cloth. \$6.50
6. Westfall, S.: **A STUDY IN POLISH MORPHOLOGY.** The Genitive
Singular Masculine. 419 pp. Cloth. \$13.00

Please send your order to your bookseller or to the above address.

"The outstanding general journal of modern language teaching in the United States"

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

brings to its readers every month stimulating and helpful articles on methods, materials, pedagogical research, publications and textbooks in the field.

Edited by J. Alan Pfeffer, The University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. Published by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.

Eight issues a year, monthly except June, July, August, and September. Current subscription \$4.00 a year. Foreign countries, \$4.50 a year net in U.S.A. funds.

Sample copy on request

The Modern Language Journal

Stephen L. Pitcher, Business Manager

7144 Washington Avenue
ST. LOUIS 30, MISSOURI

BOOKS FROM THE SOVIET UNION

**Send for our Catalogue
of Russian Study Aids.
A large Selection of
Accented Readers.**

CROSS WORLD BOOKS
AND PERIODICALS

333 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago 6, Illinois

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

The only American journal concentrating in research in the humanities and pedagogy in the field; articles, reviews, news and notes

Published by the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) through the facilities of Indiana University

Subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL for individuals. Subscription-membership: \$5.00 per year; \$2.00 for undergraduate and graduate students

Members will receive, through an arrangement with the Indiana University Slavic and East European Series, two bonus volumes during 1960:

Avrahm Yarmolinsky, *Literature Under Communism: The Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin* (1960)

The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1959

For subscriptions, advertising rates, and back numbers, write to Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the AATSEEL,

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan

Typewriters in Russian and Other Languages

New and reconditioned machines available . . . Portables and office size . . . Also other business machines.

ALL LANGUAGES TYPEWRITER
CO.

Dept. SE

119 W. 23rd St., New York 11, N.Y.

CHelsea 3-8086

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Published by the
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SLAVIC
AND EAST EUROPEAN LANGUAGES

The Slavic and East European Journal, a periodical devoted to research in language, linguistics, and literature, and to pedagogy, is the official publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, AATSEEL of the U. S., Inc., an affiliate of the Modern Language Association of America, the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations, and the Canadian Association of Slavists and East European Specialists. This publication journal is the successor to The AATSEEL Journal and The AATSEEL Bulletin. The Journal is published quarterly through the facilities of Indiana University.

Subscription to The Slavic and East European Journal is \$5.00 per year for individuals, libraries, and institutions. The subscription includes membership in the AATSEEL. A special rate of \$2.00 per year has been set for undergraduate and graduate students. Single copies may be purchased for \$1.50.

Applications for membership, subscriptions to the Journal, and all other business letters should be sent to the Executive Secretary and Treasurer: Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Communications to the Editor, books for review, manuscripts, exchange journals, and copy for advertisements should be sent to J. T. Shaw, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

The printed order of articles does not imply relative merit. Opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the editorial staff.

DOKTOR ŽIVAGO AND THE LIVING TRADITION

By Robert L. Jackson

Yale University

"... At times I have a dim presentiment of an immense danger which threatens all culture. The great wave which will wash us from off the surface of the earth will carry off more than that one which washed away powdered wigs and shirtfrills. It is true that to those who perished then it seemed that with them the whole of civilization was perishing." — Sienkiewicz's Without Dogma

"... She died or vanished nobody knows where, forgotten under some nameless number on one of those lists that afterwards got lost, in one of the innumerable mixed or women's concentration camps in the north." — Pasternak's Doktor Živago

"Life is without beginning and without end."
— Blok's "Retribution"

Doktor Živago and its author share with the great tradition of Russian literature an exceptional forthrightness, a moral fervor and a deep sense of responsibility before Russian life. Many of the philosophical, religious, and mytho-poetic motifs of Doktor Živago are part of the tapestry of Russian literature and thought. The problem of the individual facing the invincible laws of historical development — explored in all its tragic essence by Puškin in his poem "The Bronze Horseman," resolved in part in Tolstoj's War and Peace through a philosophy of reconciliation with reality — is re-explored by Pasternak in the sombre and protesting tones of Puškin's poem; yet like Puškin, Pasternak acknowledges the historical inevitability of the power crushing his hero.

The problem of the fatal cleavage between the masses of people and the intelligentsia; the question of the apocalyptic and the nihilistic as elements in the Russian nature; the conception of a family, the *Živagos*, experiencing in its separate links the retribution of history and milieu; the mystical apprehension of Russia and the dramatization of its destiny in religious terms and symbolism — all this, entering into *Doktor Živago*, defines Pasternak as a writer in the tradition of Dostoevskij, the philosopher Solov'ev, the poet Aleksandr Blok and other Russian writers and thinkers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Pasternak's *Doktor Živago* is a work which stands in close relation to Tolstoj's *War and Peace*. At the center of each work, and determining its structure, is a violent historical event embracing the life of Russian society. Both the war of 1812, in *War and Peace*, and the revolution and civil war of 1917-21, in *Doktor Živago*, are viewed as central events in a vast tidal movement of happenings the "causes" of which cannot be ascertained in conventional historical terms. "It's petty to rummage about for the causes of Cyclopean events," observes *Živago* in his prophetic speech at the duck dinner in Moscow. "There aren't any."¹ Both Tolstoj and Pasternak depict the individual as essentially powerless in the great tidal movements of history. But in *War and Peace* this powerlessness of the individual is tragic only when it is unrecognized or denied by the individual; in *Doktor Živago* it is unconditionally tragic.

The different historical character of the events of 1812 and 1917 gives shape to Tolstoj and Pasternak's radically different approach to the individual and to the individual's relation to history and the people. In his subscription prospectus to his journal *Time*, 1860, Dostoevskij called attention to the essentially centripetal character of the war of 1812: "After the reform [of Peter the Great] there was only one single case of unity between it [the people] and us, the educated class — eighteen twelve, and we saw how the people gave account of themselves."² Tolstoj in *War and Peace* apprehended 1812 in just this way; he emphasizes the national-patriotic character of the war and places in the forefront of his work, as the embodiment of his moral values, not the individual "hero," but the Russian people. War is intrinsically evil in Tolstoj's view, but it provides

a corrective to the individual's egoistic strivings; through contact with the elemental-primal force of the people — its unaffected patriotism, its instinctive self-sacrifice, its modest heroism — the individual is elevated, ennobled; the way is opened for moral-spiritual rebirth, for a reconciliation with one's own destiny, with nature, with life. "The great thing is to live in harmony," remarks the peasant Platon Karataev (in War and Peace) whom Tolstoj calls an "unfathomable, rounded, eternal personification of the spirit of simplicity and truth . . . of everything Russian, kindly and round." Tolstoj's protagonists, Prince Andrej and Pierre Bezukhov, are continually upsetting the "harmony" of Karataev's universe. Yet the rebellious elements represented by both Andrej and Pierre are never allowed to escape the magnetic field of 1812 — the ideological center of which is the people, its heroism, its moral superiority, its example.

The revolution of 1917, unlike the national war of 1812, released violently centrifugal forces which blew apart the entire structure of Russian society. Pasternak has depicted this explosion at the moment the parts of this once integral society are being scattered, but at a moment when the memories of the old world are still intact. Živago, in his impromptu address before the people gathered at the duck dinner, observes:

I too think that Russia is fated to become the first socialist kingdom since the beginning of the world. When this comes to pass, it will stun us for a long time, and, when we come to our senses, we shall have lost half our memories forever! We shall have forgotten what came first and what followed, and we shall not be looking for explanations of the unprecedented events. The new order will surround us and be as natural as a forest on the horizon or clouds overhead. It will encircle us on all sides. There will be nothing else. (Part VI, ch. 4.)

The desolation caused by the exploding revolution is depicted — in a figurative as well as literal sense — in the "Conclusion" of Doktor Živago when, half stunned by his experiences, Živago works his way across an exhausted countryside. Pasternak carries his epic through World War II when the "action of the forces" directly rooted in the nature of the upheaval ceased."

"This is the Last Judgment on earth, my good Sir," Strel'nikov (Lara's husband) remarks to Živago, "a time for creatures from the Apocalypse with swords, for winged beasts, and not for fully sympathetic and loyal doctors." The revolution is a judgment of an entire way of life. "... The doctor saw life without illusions. The fact that it was under sentence stared him in the face. He regarded himself and his milieu as doomed. ... He realized that he was a pigmy before the monstrous machine of the future."

When Živago complains that "history hasn't consulted me. I have to put up with whatever happens, so why shouldn't I ignore facts" — he is affirming more than his helplessness; he is acknowledging the complete divergence of his personal interests and those of the revolution; the machine of history is out of control and is racing blindly into the future. "Is there a reality in Russia today?" Živago asks his father-in-law. "In my opinion, it has been so frightened that it is in hiding."

Živago increasingly withdraws into himself and into the circle of his family existence. Formerly, he observes, he used to love "everybody," but now "I love only you and father." The search for the family, the hearth, is a constant one in Doktor Živago. "What could be worth more than peaceful family life and work?" Živago asks. "The rest isn't in our hands." But even the family is not in Živago's hands. The war broke down not only trains and food supplies, but also the "foundations of family life, the moral structure of consciousness."

War and Peace concludes on a note of family happiness; the world of Živago comes to an end on a poignant note of awareness that this happiness is a chimera. "... We keep bustling about hastily so as not to see that this isn't life, but a stage set, that it isn't real, only 'pretend,' as children say ... " Lara remarks ("Return to Varykino"). The joy of Varykino is a tragic one; like Ivan Karamazov's love for the "precious graveyard" of Europe, it is built on a love for that which is dying — an entire way of life, an entire world. "... What disrupted your family life if you loved each other so much?" Živago asks Lara, who replies:

Ah, how difficult it is to answer that. I'll tell you about it now. But how strange. How is it that I, a weak woman, should explain to you, such a wise

person, what is happening now to life in general, to human life in Russia, and why families get broken up, including yours and mine. Ah, as though it were a matter of people, of being alike or different in temperament, of loving or not loving. Everything that has been evolved, brought to working form, everything relating to normal everyday living, to the human abode and to order, all this has crumbled in the upheaval of all society and in its reconstruction. The whole human reality has been upturned and destroyed. All that remains is the isolated, alienated, unapplied strength of the naked soul stripped to the last shred; and nothing has changed for this soul, because at all times it has been cold, trembling and reaching out to its nearest neighbor, just as naked and lonely as itself. You and I are like Adam and Eve, the first two people on earth who at the beginning of the world had nothing to hide, and we are now at the end of it, just as naked and homeless. And we are the last remembrance of all that immeasurable greatness which has been created in the world in all the thousands of years between them and us, and it is in the memory of those vanished marvels that we breathe and love and weep, hold one another and cling to one another. (Part XIII, ch. 13.)

The world that is mourned in this Liebestod of the Russian intelligentsia, finds its most lofty expression in Russian literature in Tolstoj's War and Peace. "We go on endlessly re-reading War and Peace, Evgenij Onegin and all the poems . . ." Živago writes in his notebook during his initial stay in Varykino — that final effort of the Živago family to re-establish the pattern of its home life. Živago finds in Puškin's writings a "paean to honest labor, duty, the habits of everyday life!" He cites approvingly lines from Puškin's "The Travels of Onegin": "My ideal now is a housewife / My desires — tranquility / And a big bowl of cabbage soup."

Not surprisingly does the Živago family steep itself in Tolstoj's War and Peace and Puškin's Evgenij Onegin. For the world of these works — with its moral rectitude, its sanctity of marriage and the hearth, its established customs and traditions — is the lost center of Doktor Živago. Of this world, of its unique and almost anomalous position in Russian life, Dostoevskij speaks at the conclusion of his

novel The Raw Youth. The young Arkakij Dolgorukij writes to his mentor:

Puškin selected the subjects for his future novels from the "traditions of a Russian family," and, believe me, that everything beautiful we have had so far is to be found therein. At least everything that has been brought to some sort of perfection. I don't say this because I am accepting unconditionally the truth and justness of this beauty; but here, for example, there were completely worked out forms of honor and duty which, except in the nobility, have never existed in Russia even in the most rudimentary shape. I speak as a calm man seeking calm. Whether that honor was a good thing, and whether that duty was a true one — is a secondary question; but what is more important to me is precisely the finality of these forms and the existence of at least some sort of order, and not prescribed, but at last developed from within. Good heavens, what really matters most of all is to have at last any sort of order of our own! All hopes for the future and, so to say, restfulness of outlook lie in our having something at last built up, instead of this everlasting destruction, instead of chips flying in all directions, instead of rubbish and disorder which has led to nothing for two hundred years. (Part III, ch. xiii.)

The problem of Russian culture here posed is the dichotomy between the perfect "forms," "beauty," and "order" created by the educated classes, and the formlessness and "disorder" surging below. "There are no foundations to our society," Dostoevskij wrote in some notes to The Raw Youth, "no principles to live out their efficacy, because there has been no life even. A colossal eruption and everything is cracking, falling, being negated as though it had not existed. And not only externally, as in the West, but internally, morally."

The crisis of Russian culture in Doktor Živago — of "everything that has been evolved, brought to working form, everything relating to normal everyday living, to the human abode and to order" — is depicted against a background of chaos and disorder rising from below. The confrontation of the eloquent Senator's son Ginc with the soldier-deserters in Doktor Živago is not only a meeting of two revolutions — the bourgeois-democratic February revolution and the

October Bolshevik revolution — but a symbolic encounter between two Russias: the one taking its provenience in the nineteenth century “nests of gentle folk,” the world of the Rostov family (War and Peace) with its recognized forms of honor, duty, and virtue, and the other in the inchoate and centrifugal material of the Russian masses. The ominous, sullen challenge of these masses is hinted at in War and Peace when the serfs on Princess Mar'ja Bolkonskaja's estate at Bogučarovo — at the time the French armies were moving on Moscow — refuse to assist in her departure. The obdurate peasants are mastered singlehandedly by the young Count Nikolaj Rostov, who declined to await armed help in bringing the peasants to order. The little fires of Bogučarovo became the conflagration of 1917. The place of the masterful Nikolaj Rostov is filled by his modern counterpart Ginc, with his “sense of honor cultivated through generations, a city bred sense of honor, imbued with a sense of self-sacrifice, and out of place here,” with his foolhardy bravery, his eloquent phrases, his class-rooted underevaluation of the people. “The people, he says, are like children, and so forth, and he thinks that all this is a child's game. Galjullin entreats with him: don't arouse the beast, he says, leave him to us . . . ”

Ginc is killed when he singlehandedly tries to deal with the soldier-deserters; he is killed by Pamfil Palyx, a soldier of the tsarist army “with an inborn class instinct.” This soldier, who is later disclosed as a cruel degenerate (“The Forest Brotherhood”), is characterized as a type by Pasternak:

In those first days [of the revolution] people like the soldier Pamfil Palyx were regarded as rare finds by ecstatic left-wing intellectuals and were greatly valued; without any encouragement these people hated with a terrible and savage hatred intellectuals, gentry, and officers. Their inhumanity seemed a miracle of class consciousness, their barbarity a model of proletarian firmness and revolutionary instinct. Such was the fame that Pamfil had acquired. He was held in the highest esteem by the partisan chiefs and Party leaders. (Part XI, ch. 9.)

The tragically absurd Ginc and the wild “beast” Pamfil — it is between these two extreme antitheses that Pasternak

places his hero Živago. Živago is of course sympathetic with Ginc, as he is later with the cadets at whom he must fire in the forest skirmish — those “heroically dying children” who belonged to families “close to him in spirit, education, moral make-up, and values.” But Pasternak underlines their fatal eloquence, their false adherence to form and divorce from realities. The Russian intellectual in Pasternak’s portrayal is incapable of playing any vital role in the revolution. “‘Make it snappy, Jura! Put on your coat and let’s go,’” cries Živago’s uncle, Nikolaž Nikolaevič, bursting in to announce the street fighting on the eve of the October seizure of power. “‘You’ve got to see it. This is history. This happens but once in a lifetime.’ But he himself went on talking for a couple of hours . . . ”

But it is the people — the “beast” — that has risen to challenge the privileges of the ruling classes that causes Pasternak to recoil. Nowhere is Pasternak’s rejection of Tolstoj’s idealized image of the “people” more strongly felt than in those pages of Doktor Živago devoted to Živago’s enforced stay with the partisans. The ordeal of Živago, his eighteen months’ captivity, is a completely antipathetic experience; it could stand, in its essentials, in sharp polemical contrast to Pierre Bezuxov’s experiences as a Russian prisoner of war during the French retreat. Pierre’s experiences on the battlefield of Borodino fill him with an admiration for the soldiers and arouse in him a desire to “enter into this communal life completely, to become imbued with that which makes them what they are. But how cast off all this superfluous, devilish burden of my outer self.” The possibility is offered Pierre. His semi-delirious experiences in deserted Moscow (when, in his desire to kill Napoleon and save the world from the “antichrist,” he himself falls prey to Tolstoj’s heresy of individualism) are followed by his experiences as a Russian prisoner of war. Here, enduring hardships with other Russians, Pierre meets Platon Karataev who comes to embody for him the ideal in harmonious orientation to man’s fate. Pierre “learned that just as there is no condition in the world in which man can be happy and completely free, so there is no condition in which he need be completely unhappy and lack freedom.”

In contrast to Pierre, Jurij Živago sharply experiences

his captivity (in which he actually enjoyed considerable freedom of movement) as "unfreedom"; far from entering into the communal life of the brotherhood and divesting himself of his "outer self," Živago retreats more deeply within himself in hostile recoil from the life around him. Živago finds no Karataev in the brotherhood to give meaning to his condition, to rationalize it. All that Živago has to console him are the maddening homilies and political pep talk of the dope fiend leader of the partisans, Liverij (Liberius), who imagines that Živago is depressed because of a lack of faith in the triumph of the Red forces. Liverij finally drives Živago to exclaim with almost Dostoevskian "underground" rebelliousness:

Try to understand, try to understand, once and for all, that all this means nothing to me. "Jupiter," "never panic," "whoever says A must say B," "the Moor has done his work, the Moor can go" — all these vulgar commonplaces, all these expressions mean nothing to me. I will say A but I won't say B — even if you break me up and pound me to pieces. I admit that you are the shining lights and liberators of Russia, that without you everything would be lost, sunk in misery and ignorance, and still I don't give a whit for you and spit on you, I don't like you, and may you all go to the devil.
(Part XI, ch. 5.)

Živago, who cannot kill the enemy cadets in whom he recognizes people like himself, is driven by Liverij to murderous thoughts: "Oh, how I hate him! As God is my witness, I'll kill him some day.... Lord, Lord! And that loathesome, insensate animal is still orating and won't let up! Oh, some day I'll lose control of myself and kill him, I'll kill him."

The episode "The Forest Brotherhood," with its accent on civil war, the atrocities committed by both Reds and Whites, on the internal struggles and purges among the partisans, on the degenerates Pamfil Palyx and Liverij, brings to a high point the impression of chaos and irrationality closing in on Živago. The isolation of Živago here, broken only by his escape to Jurjatin and then to Varykino for the last time with Lara, portends his final absolute isolation and destruction. To the rising chaos around him Živago opposes the perfectly developed forms of his culture

— his poetry — in an effort to come to grips with this chaos, to divine its meaning, to define himself, Lara, Russia, life. His poetry enters the future as a force in the rebirth of Russia, but he himself perishes in his earthly alienation, unable to participate in the renewal that his poetry itself portends. Živago's mother is defined as a "gentle dreamer." The tragedy of Živago, though linked with the tragedy of the middle classes and the Russian intelligentsia, is essentially that of the dreamer, the poet whose world — for all his desire to participate in it as a "socially useful" being — was not so much the real world as the forêt de symboles of Baudelaire's poem. Lara, at the funeral of Živago, defines his relation, as well as her own, to the world.

The riddle of life, the riddle of death, the enchantment of genius, the enchantment of unadorned beauty, this, if you please, this was ours. But petty world squabbles like reconstructing the earth, these things, no thank you, they are not for us. (Part XV, ch. 16.)

If Živago in Pasternak's conception bears within him the seed of Russia's creative future, it is Lara, "charged ... with all the imaginable femininity in the world," who is the maternal embodiment of Russian life in its ferment, the Ewig-weibliche, the Margaret of Pasternak's own chorus mysticus drawing forward his sinking hero, his abortive Faust, sustaining him in his last flowing.

Lara was the "indictment of the age," Strel'nikov remarks of Lara, and it is the wronged Lara that is identified with the revolution in all its aspects. The abyss into which Lara fears she is sinking, in the early days of her relationship with the corrupt lawyer Komarovskij, is the abyss of Russian life opened up by misery and oppression. It is symbolic that Lara succumbs to the assault of Komarovskij, that her "purity" is defiled and that she is subject to the mysterious "spell" of Komarovskij — confidante of Živago's father, the dissolute, guilt-ridden representative of old bourgeois Russia. "Now she has become his slave for life. How has he subjugated her?" Komarovskij — who lives in a part of Moscow that resembles St. Petersburg — never loses his power over the girl from Moscow.

Tolstoj's heroine, Nataša Rostova, this living Tolstoyan embodiment of instinctive, spontaneous Muscovite Russia,

is also the object of a concerted assault by the Petersburg element in Russian life — by the Kuragins; she is also carried away into a “strange, senseless world . . . a world in which it was impossible to know what was good or bad . . .” Nataša, falling in love with Anatolij Kuragin, feels that he is her “master” and that she is his “slave, yes, his slave! . . . I told you, I have no will.” But the assault of the Petersburg Kuragins on the Rostov family is turned back. This victory of the Rostovs — this preservation of the purity and honor of Nataša — is not an accidental element in War and Peace, but an integral part, on the ideological plane of Tolstoj’s epic, of the victory of Russia in 1812. It is a reflection of the triumph of the primal Moscow element over Petersburg with its show and artificiality, of the Russian people over Napoleon. The preservation of the purity of Nataša is the prelude to that final triumph of the maternal element in the Epilogue — the family life of Nataša. The defiling of Lara’s purity portends the disintegration of the whole fabric of Russian life and of its central unit — the family. Lara, dominated by the child-hating Komarovskij, abandons Tanja, her daughter by Živago. It is significant that the area of Lara’s greatest failure — the family and motherhood — should be the area of Nataša Rostova’s greatest triumph.

“The whole development of the world tends to the importance of the individual,” Kierkegaard wrote in his Journal in 1847; “that, and nothing else, is the principle of Christianity.” The individual is at the center of Pasternak’s universe, the humanism of the individual — in the sense that Kierkegaard understood it — as opposed to the benevolent humanism of an ideology, social system, state. The people, the masses, far from being a source of creativity to Kierkegaard’s “individual” is a central antagonist of him. Kierkegaard wrote in his Journal in 1847:

“The masses”: that is really the aim of the polemic . . . I wish to make people aware, so that they do not squander and dissipate their lives. . . . I wish to make men aware of their own ruin. And if they will not listen to good then I will compel them through evil. Understand me, or at least do not misunderstand me. I do not mean that I am going to strike them (alas, one cannot strike the masses); I mean to make them strike me.

And in that way I all the same compel them through evil. For if they once strike me they will be made aware of their position, and I shall have won an absolute victory.... The reformer who, as it is said, fights against a powerful man (a pope, an emperor, an individual man) must aim at bringing about the fall of the powerful; but the man who, with more justice, takes arms against the masses, from whom comes all corruption, must see to it that he himself falls.

Živago, like Kierkegaard's man who takes arms against the masses, is marked out for sacrifice; but here, in Pasternak's design, lies his paradoxical victory. "You are a mockery of that world," Komarovskij observes to Živago, "an offense to it." The remark, however, applies not so much to a wilful effort on Živago's part to mock communism, as to what Živago symbolizes in his inevitable choice of isolation, in his inability and unwillingness to come to terms with the revolutionary camp (or any camp), in his clear insistence on living out in his own person his conception of Christianity. The defeat of Živago — in the light of his own meditations and those of his uncle on Christianity — is for Pasternak a moral triumph; at the basis of this triumph lie the "chief components of modern man, without which he is unthinkable, namely, the idea of free personality and the idea of life as sacrifice."

"In life it is more necessary to lose than to gain," Pasternak observes in his autobiographical sketch "I Remember." "A seed will germinate only if it dies." This idea is at the basis of the conception of Doktor Živago, as it is at the basis of Dostoevsky's Brothers Karamazov. Dostoevskij took the epigraph for his novel from the Gospel of St. John: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." The violent, earthly Karamazov force in Fedor Karamazov plunges into the ground, but is reborn and redirected in Aleša (Dmitrij already at the end of his trial feels within him a "new man" and predicts that "Ivan will surpass us all"). Central to Dostoevskij's novel was the Russian philosopher Fedorov's idea that the sons must resurrect the fathers.

A variation on this theme may be found in Aleksandr Blok's beautiful, though unfinished poem "Retribution"; here, against the background of the late 1870's and the

mal de siècle of the 1900's, the poet traces the degeneration and ultimate resurrection of a family line. In a Preface to his poem, Blok wrote that he conceived it

in the form of concentric circles which grew narrower and narrower, until the smallest circle, compressed to its limit, begins again to live its own independent life, to break open and spread out against the surrounding milieu and, in its turn, to act upon the periphery.... The theme consists in showing the development of the links of a unified chain making up a family line. Separate offspring of each generation develop to their appointed limit and then are swallowed up anew by the surrounding milieu; but in each offspring there ripens and is made something new and something more enduring, at the price of endless losses, personal tragedies, failures in life, falls, etc.... There was a man — and then was not; there remains trashy, flabby flesh and a rotting little soul. But the seed is cast forth, and in the next youngling there grows something new, more stubborn; and in the last youngling this new and stubborn thing begins, at last, tangibly to act upon the surrounding environment; in this way a generation, which has experienced the retribution of history, of milieu, of the epoch, begins in its turn to create retribution; the last youngling is already capable of snarling and giving forth leonine growls; he is ready to grasp with his little manly hand the wheel which moves the history of mankind. And perhaps he will in some way grasp at it ... What more is there to say? I don't know ... I can only say that this whole conception took shape under the pressure of a growing hatred in me for various theories of progress.³

Pasternak's Doktor Živago, of course, took shape under similar pressures of hatred for various "theories of progress." Blok's conception of his poem is suggestive of a basic creative idea underlying Doktor Živago: the portrayal of the Russian revolution — the painful drama of Russian progress — in terms of an organic life process in which continuity is not lost but re-translated in new links of life. Jurij Živago is at the center of Pasternak's work; but at its outermost limits — and these are the limits of the epoch depicted — are two other Živago's: Jurij's father and Jurij's daughter, Tanja. In a religious-ethical sense, the dramas of these three generations constitute a single

completed cycle — a cycle of sin, suffering, and redemption.

"Who is being buried?" asked the passers-by as they made way for the funeral procession of Živago's mother. "Živago," they were told. The juxtaposition of the words "buried" and "Živago" (Živago is derived from the Russian word "to live"), and the ascendancy given to the latter, on the opening page of Pasternak's work, establishes the basic theme of death and resurrection in Doktor Živago.

The opening chapter "Five O'Clock Express" has three high points: the death of Živago's mother (the introduction of the theme of resurrection); the remarks of Jurij's uncle Nikolaj Nikolaevič defining love of one's neighbor, the idea of free personality, and the idea of sacrifice as basic attributes of modern man; and the suicide of Živago's father. (The "Five O'Clock Express" is delayed when Jurij Živago's wealthy father throws himself off the train.) Not the theme of resurrection, but that of damnation is hinted in connection with the death of Jurij's father; old Živago in his life has negated the basic attributes of modern man: he has abandoned two families and devoted himself to the accumulation of material goods, and in the manner of his death he has violated the very spirit of life. "He can wait, he'll have to have patience," thinks young Jurij Živago as he postpones saying prayers for his father whose suicide takes place in the episode that follows.

Jurij Živago does not assume the financial burdens of his father, but he bears the stigma of the "bourgeois." He perishes, swallowed up by the surrounding revolution. But the poetry of Živago survives, and it is Tanja — the fruit of Živago and Lara — who painfully inherits the new world. Tanja Bežočeredeva (Tanja Out-of-Turn) is "Fatherless"; a laundry girl, she is no longer linked to the bourgeois past; her "terrible story" links her with the rebirth of Russia, of which she is a part. "It's the same type, you see it all over Russia," Dudorov observes of Tanja's face. In Tanja the alienation of Jurij Živago has been overcome in actuality; it is for Tanja that the "portents of freedom," of which Pasternak speaks at the end of his work, have most meaning. Pasternak's drama of death and resurrection completes its cycle in Tanja.

The death of old Russia and the rebirth of a new Russia,

in Pasternak's creative design, essentially are a part of the mystery of all death and birth — the mystery Živago contemplates after the birth of his son:

Raised higher towards the ceiling than ordinary mortals usually are, Tonja lay in the cloud of her spent pain, as though smoking from exhaustion. Tonja dominated in the middle of the ward the way a barque might stand out in a bay — a barque that had just moored and been unloaded, after having completed a voyage across the sea of death to the continent of life with new souls immigrating from nobody knows where. One such soul had just been landed and the ship now lay at anchor, resting, its flanks unburdened, empty. The whole of her was resting — her overstrained masts, and planking, and her oblivion, her vanished memory of the place where she had been recently, the crossing and the landing. And since nobody had explored the country under whose flag she was registered, no one knew the language in which to speak to her. (Part IV, ch. 5.)

In Doktor Živago, Pasternak completes the cycle of his own "Retribution," but without sacrificing what he feels to be the truth of his generation, a truth that illuminates the tragedy of the pre-revolutionary Russian intelligentsia.

To many of the young generation of Russians, brought up on the heroes and martyrs of the revolution, seeking new heroes, and emulating old ones, who can utter Gogol's mighty word "Forward!" Živago indeed may seem an incomprehensible, if not completely alien figure as he stands alone in the fiery twilight of his generation. To others, of this same generation, the word "hero" will have a more tragic ring. And they may recall the poet Aleksandr Blok who observed in his poem "Retribution" of the gentry family that experienced woe from both people and tsar:

All this may seem
Ridiculous and old-fashioned to us,
But really, only a boor
Can mock Russian life.
It is always between two fires,
Not everyone can become a hero,
And the best people — we will not conceal it —
Are often impotent before it,
So unexpectedly severe it is,
And full of eternal changes;

Like a spring river it
Suddenly is ready to move,
To pile up floes of ice
And in its path to crush
The guilty, as well as the innocent,
Those without rank, as well as those with rank.⁴

Notes

1. All citations are from the Russian edition published in the United States: Boris Pasternak, Doktor Živago (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958).

2. Dostoevskij, Stat'i, Polnoe sobranie khudožestvennykh proizvedenij, XIII (Moskva, 1930), 498.

3. Aleksandr Blok, Sočinenija v dvux tomax (Moskva: Gosizdat, 1955), I, 478-479.

4. Blok, I, 493-494.

YOUNG LEV TOLSTOJ'S ACQUAINTANCE
WITH STERNE'S SERMONS AND
GRIFFITH'S THE KORAN

By Peter Rudy
Northwestern University

I

There is ample evidence that by May 1852 Lev Tolstoj was very familiar with Laurence Sterne's The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman, and A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy.¹ To these books the definitive Jubilee edition of Tolstoj's complete works has also added the "Memoirs of the Life and Family of the Late Rev. Mr. Laurence Sterne," an essay of some twelve pages.² Unfortunately, this addition to the books read by Tolstoj is based on an incorrect identification of two quotations which he copied into his reading journal on June 2, 1851. The first quotation, which Tolstoj attributed to "Sénèque," is in Latin and reads as follows: "Et quae fuerunt vitia, mores sunt." The second, which follows immediately, is in French: "La conversation est un trafic; et si l'on l'entreprend sans fonds, la balance penche et le commerce tombe (Sterne)." According to the Jubilee edition, the first statement was "copied by Tolstoj from a little-known work of L. Sterne which he was reading in French: 'Mémoires de Sterne' (Oeuvres complètes de L. Sterne, traduites de l'anglais, nouvelle édition, Paris, 1818, t. I, p. 17)." The second sentence is also traced to the "Mémoires," and reference is made to page 641 in the same volume.³

Actually, the second excerpt, with which I shall begin in order to present the evidence in a clearer form, is a variant of a remark from Sterne's twentieth sermon, "The Prodigal Son": "Conversation is a traffic; and if you enter into it, without some stock of knowledge to balance the account perpetually betwixt you, — the trade drops at once. . . ." ⁴ The quotation from Seneca apparently found its way

into Tolstoj's journal by way of Richard Griffith's The Koran: or, The Life, Character, and Sentiments, of Tria Juncta in Uno, M.N.A. or Master of No Arts, a counterfeit work published in some early editions of Sterne's writings. This point is established by a simple comparison of Seneca's original statement with the Griffith variation and the Tolstoj version quoted above. Seneca's thirty-ninth epistle to Lucilius ends as follows: "[T]unc autem est consummata infelicitas, ubi turpia non solum delectant, sed etiam placent, et desinit esse remedio locus, ubi quae fuerant vitia, mores sunt."⁵ In The Koran Griffith renders the last part of this sentence as: "Et quae fuerunt vitia, mores sunt."⁶ Tolstoj's version agrees with Griffith's except for one irrelevant difference: Griffith italicizes the quotation, something that he does habitually with short Latin remarks in The Koran. Since Tolstoj's excerpt coincides with that of Griffith, since the credit is given in French ("Sénèque"), and since the quotation appears in Tolstoj's journal immediately before the French variant from "The Prodigal Son," there seems to be little doubt that this remark in Latin was taken from a French translation of Sterne's works which identified the original source.

II

The quotation from the twentieth sermon, "The Prodigal Son," in the reading journal entry of June 2, 1851 naturally raises the question of the extent and nature of Tolstoj's interest in Sterne's homiletic writing. From an examination of the available materials, it appears that as early as March 21 of the same year Tolstoj had already read Sterne's first sermon, "Inquiry after Happiness"; that by the next day he was familiar with the second sermon, "The House of Feasting and the House of Mourning Described"; that he used these and the succeeding eighteen sermons (through "The Prodigal Son") as a means of learning English; and that in the following month he was inspired by Sterne to attempt the sermon genre himself. The evidence for this reconstruction involves several factors: similarities between Tolstoj's personal observations in his reading journal on March 21 and 22⁷ and material in Sterne's first two sermons; remarks by Tolstoj in his diary entries of March 22 and April 6 and 8; and also the quotation from "The

Prodigal Son" in the journal for June 2. When all of these points are considered together, they suggest a pattern which seems to be beyond the reach of mere chance.

What appears to be an adaptation from Sterne's first sermon, "Inquiry after Happiness," can be found in the rambling essay on sophisticated didactic literature which comprises Tolstoj's reading journal entry for March 21, 1851. Sterne closed his sermon with a rhetorical flight in the course of which, while discussing the fruitlessness of Solomon's worldly pursuit of happiness, he drew a parallel to a man seeking the philosopher's stone without success. First we learn that "never did the busy brain of a lean and hectic chemist search for the philosopher's stone with more pains and ardour than this great man did after happiness." A little later we are informed that "like the chemist's projections, all had ended in smoke, or what was worse, in vanity and vexation of spirit. . . ." ⁸ As Tolstoj closed the essay in his reading journal, he also indulged in a rhetorical flourish, using a figure that involved the search for the philosopher's stone. However, since Tolstoj's aim was to show the value of man's pursuit of virtue through sophisticated literature, he visualized the result of the search for the stone in more positive terms: "The philosopher's stone was sought and many chemical combinations were found." ⁹ In both Sterne and Tolstoj, then, the quest of an ideal is dramatized in a rhetorical ending that contains a comparison with the search for the philosopher's stone, the outcome of the search depending on the point that the individual author is trying to make.

Another apparent reflection of Sterne as a writer of sermons appears in Tolstoj's reading journal entry of March 22, 1851, ¹⁰ where there is a grouping of ideas similar to that in Sterne's first two sermons, "Inquiry after Happiness" and "The House of Feasting and the House of Mourning Described." In his first sermon Sterne stresses the importance of virtue as one of the keystones of happiness in this world. Sterne's second sermon emphasizes two main points: that worldly pleasures may easily result in greater or lesser vices and that our afflictions and those of our fellow men lead us to virtue. ¹¹ While discussing Bernardin de Saint-Pierre's Paul et Virginie in his journal on March 22, Tolstoj neatly spelled out a series of formulae

that bears a close resemblance to Sterne's cluster of ideas: "Misfortune makes [man] virtuous — virtue makes [him] happy — happiness makes [him] depraved." As Tolstoj's subsequent remarks indicate, the happiness that leads to depravity is different from that produced by virtue. Like Sterne's pleasures, this undesirable happiness is rooted in worldly concerns.¹²

The evidence not only points to Tolstoj's acquaintance with Sterne's first two sermons by March 22, but it also suggests that Tolstoj may have read these sermons as part of his program for studying the English language. In his diary entry for March 22, Tolstoj tied memory exercises and English language study together: "Gymnastics are essential for the development of all faculties. The gymnastics of memory. — Learn something by heart every day. The English language."¹³ Earlier, Tolstoj had repeatedly used the phrase "the English language" in referring to his program of studying English by reading The Vicar of Wakefield, learning the unfamiliar words in the novel, and going "through the first part of a grammar."¹⁴ Since the diary now mentioned the same phrase with a specific reference to memorization exercises at a time when the reading journal seemed to be reflecting the first two sermons, the obvious conclusion is that Tolstoj may have been using these sermons as practice material in learning English. Also, since Tolstoj was later, on June 2, 1851, to take the two quotations from a French version of Sterne's works and since, later in the year and on into the spring of 1852, he was to rely on a French copy as an aid in translating Sterne's A Sentimental Journey, it would appear that in March 1851 he may have been studying the sermons with the help of a French translation.¹⁵

Tolstoj's diary also seems to indicate that this possible acquaintance with the two sermons, at least, may have produced a very concrete result within a short period of time. In his diary entry of April 6, 1851, Tolstoj expressed his desire to write sermons; and in his entry two days later, he stated that he had already composed a sermon.¹⁶ Since the writing of sermons was a singularly strange pastime for a layman of that day, even for one who was experiencing a quickening of religious feeling, it seems logical to conclude that Tolstoj's short-lived interest in experimenting

with the homiletic art may have grown out of a contact with Sterne's sermons.

There is some evidence, then, that by March 21, 1851, Tolstoj had read Sterne's first sermon, "Inquiry after Happiness," and that by the following day he was also acquainted with the second, "The House of Feasting and the House of Mourning Described." Tolstoj's desire to study English, expressed on March 22, would provide one reason for reading these sermons. Further, his venture into the homiletic genre between April 6 and 8 points to the sermons as a possible source of inspiration. Finally, on June 2 Tolstoj quoted from Sterne's twentieth sermon, "The Prodigal Son"; and this suggests that Tolstoj in his study of English, had worked his way through the first twenty sermons by that date. When they are taken individually, all of these conclusions seem to be tentative, since they are based on fragmentary evidence; but when they are viewed together, they appear to be statements of fact, for they indicate a pattern which apparently rules out coincidence.

III

The knowledge that Tolstoj had read a sizeable portion of Griffith's The Koran by June 2, 1851, enables us to provide an additional dimension to Tolstoj's observations about "Sterne" in a diary entry of a little more than two months later. On August 10 of that year, Tolstoj remarked: "Despite the tremendous talent for narration and clever chatter of my favorite writer, Sterne, [I find that] even his digressions are dull." ¹⁷ Obviously Tolstoj was referring here not only to Tristram Shandy and A Sentimental Journey, with which he was acquainted, but also to the spurious The Koran, a narrative that, confusing digression with disorganization, rambles along in a painfully uninspired fashion. Tolstoj's "Sterne," then, was really a composite figure of the master and his imitator.

Reflections of The Koran are also seen in the second draft of Tolstoj's first published work, Childhood. Griffith's narrator describes his highly emotional reaction to literature and then adds: "But such things as these have not their effect upon every one. The many read only with their eyes, and hear only with their ears. The few peruse with their whole soul, and listen with all their feelings. Intuition and

sensibility are the only organs of genius or of virtue." ¹⁸ This conception of a reader who belongs to a select group and whose reading is governed by intuition and sensibility is also very important in the chapter which Tolstoj addressed "To the Readers" in the second draft of Childhood.¹⁹ Here Tolstoj wrote of his circle of "select readers." A member of this circle must possess several qualifications. Four of these stamp him as a man of sensibility: he must be sensitive, i. e., capable of reacting with emotion to fiction; he must love his recollections; he must be a religious person; and he must search for those spots in the book that will touch him to the quick and not for those that will make him laugh. A fifth requirement is "understanding," and Tolstoj's discussion shows this word to be a synonym for "intuition." "Understanding" people are those to whom "you don't have to explain your feelings and tendency," those who understand you and whose souls respond to every utterance of your own heart. In dealing with such people "one can, with complete confidence, transmit [to them] thoughts that are most unclear in an expressed form. There are such subtle, elusive relationships of feeling which cannot be clearly expressed, but which are understood very clearly. One can speak boldly with them [the 'understanding' people] about these feelings and relationships by the use of hints and arbitrary words." ²⁰

Not only did Griffith influence the portrait of the reader in the prefatory "To the Readers," but he also helped Tolstoj shape a self-portrait. Masquerading as Sterne, Griffith in The Koran had confessed that emotional sensitivity was his sole strength: "After this careless manner did I ramble through my pages [in Tristram Shandy], in mere idleness and sport — till some occurrence of humanity laid hold of me by the breast, and pulled me aside. Here lies my only fort [*sic*]. What we strongest feel, we can best express." ²¹ In a letter to his aunt, Tat'jana Aleksandrovna Ergol'skaja, on January 12, 1852, Tolstoj used this very idea of the "only fort" in describing himself: "... [V]ous me connaissez trop bien et vous connaissez que peut être ma seule bonne qualité c'est la sensibilité." ²²

Notes

1. Sof'ja Andreevna Tolstaja, "Materialy k biografii L. N. Tolstogo i svedenija o semejstve Tolstyx i preimuščestvenno gr.

L'va Nikolaeviča Tolstogo," in L. N. Tolstoj v vospominanijax sovremennikov, ed. N. L. Brodskij et al. (n.p., 1955), I, 50. See also Tolstoj's journal and diary, with the commentaries, for June 4 and 11, 1851; July 3, 1851; March 20, 21, and 24, 1852; April 8 and 12-14, 1852; and May 10, 1852. Ley Nikolaevič Tolstoj, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, ed. V. G. Čertkov (Moskva, 1934), XLVI, 61, 65, 79, 93, 97-98, 100, 108-110, 115, 354, 356, 360, 375, 377, 383, 385, and 389-390.

2. Laurence Sterne, The Complete Works and Life of Laurence Sterne, Introd. Wilbur L. Cross (New York and London [c. 1899]), I, liii-lxiv.

3. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, XLVI, 78 and 360.

4. The Complete Works and Life of Laurence Sterne, V, 333.

5. L. Annaei Senecae, Opera quae supersunt, ed. Otto Hense (Leipzig, 1898), III, 111.

6. Laurence Sterne, The Works of Laurence Sterne (Edinburgh, 1803), VIII, 79 (Pt. I, Ch. xl).

7. The exact dates of the two sections of the reading journal involved in this analysis can be determined from Tolstoj's dated diary. The conception and actual composition of the first section ("Lamartin govorit, što ... poleznyx moral'nyx istin"), in which Tolstoj disputes Lamartine's thesis in Genevieve and judges the whole novel in the light of this thesis, are reflected 1) in the March 20 diary plans, where Tolstoj makes mention of rereading Lamartine (as well as his own writing) and writing on the following day and 2) in the March 21 diary entry, in which Tolstoj observes that he did a little writing on that date. The genesis of the second section ("[Paul et Virginie] ... dobrodet [eli] sčast'e — ničem."), with its run of four French quotations and two paragraphs of commentary in Russian related to the last two quotations, is to be found in the March 21 diary note, which indicates that Tolstoj did some reading on that day, and in the March 22 diary entry, which refers to the writing of "excerpts" and "observations." Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, XLVI, 48-54 and 70-73.

8. The Complete Works and Life of Laurence Sterne, V, 17.

9. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, XLVI, 70-72.

10. See above, Note 7.

11. The Complete Works and Life of Laurence Sterne, V, 8, 16-17, 21-22, and 23-33.

12. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, XLVI, 72-73.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

14. Diary entry for April 7, 1847, *ibid.*, p. 29. Entries in the "Žurnal ežednevnyx zanjatij" for April 7-19, 1847, *ibid.*, pp. 254-257.

15. The commentary on Sentimental'noe putešestvie, *ibid.*, (1928), I, 340-341. In his diary entry for April 14, 1852,

Tolstoj wrote of reading Sterne that day and then proceeded to cite in English a memorized passage from A Sentimental Journey. Ibid., XLVI, 110. Accordingly, the Jubilee edition's commentator would seem to be overcautious in stating that "perhaps" the translation was made from the English original.

16. Ibid., XLVI, 58.

17. Ibid., p. 82. The italics are mine, inserted for the purpose of preserving the sense of the original.

18. The Works of Laurence Sterne, VIII, 53-54 (Pt. I, Ch. xxvii).

19. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, I, 207-208. This chapter, intended as the first, was dropped from the succeeding redaction. However, it was apparently reinstated in the final version, as is suggested by Tolstoj's reference to "a few prefatory words" in his undischpatched letter of November 18, 1852 to Nekrasov, the editor of The Contemporary. Evidently the editor, who took considerable liberties with the manuscript, also deleted this prefatory chapter. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, I, 332.

20. The sixth qualification for the select circle is a lack of contempt for social superiority.

The idea of "understanding" as it applies to people in general was described by Tolstoj earlier in the "Second Part" of the first draft of Childhood. Ibid., pp. 153-155. That Tolstoj started this "Second Part" long after he had finished the section of The Koran under discussion (June 2, 1851) is apparent from the following evidence: In his diary entry for August 22, 1851, Tolstoj indicated his desire to start rewriting the initial draft of the first section; and he referred to this section, which had not been given a title in the manuscript, as "the first chapter of the novel." Ibid., XLVI, 86. This "first chapter" later became the basis for what the diary entry of March 20, 1852 called "the first part" (of the second redaction). Ibid., XLVI, 93. What was initially planned to be rewritten as a "chapter" became a "part" consisting of many chapters. Since the second section of the initial draft bears the title "Second Part," it is obvious that this section was started after August 22, 1851, i. e., after Tolstoj began to consider the first section a "part." At one time N. N. Gusev erroneously claimed that the first draft was completed in March 1851. He did this by arbitrarily considering remarks in the diary entries of March 28-31 and April 1 as references to Childhood when, in fact, these remarks really apply to "A History of Yesterday," the sketch on which Tolstoj was working at that time. Lev Nikolaevič Tolstoj: Materialy k biografii s 1828 po 1855 god (Moskva, 1954), I, 285. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, XLVI, 56 and 57. Later he simply assumed that the first draft was completed by July 3. Letopis' žizni i tvorčestva L'va Nikolaeviča Tolstogo (Moskva, 1958), p. 46.

21. The Works of Laurence Sterne, VIII, 74 (Pt. I, Ch. xxxviii).

22. Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (1935), LIX, 162.

IN THE STINKING CITY:
DOSTOEVSKIJ'S CRIME AND PUNISHMENT

By F. D. Reeve
Columbia University

In an essay on Maeterlinck, the Russian poet Blok said that creative writing "is all delicate flowers" and berated literary critics and teachers for "leaning their elbows on them and delivering lectures about how Ivan Karamazov's 'way out of contradictions' is found in Christianity." The viability of Dostoevskij's novels and stories does not depend on his religious philosophy — ultimately, "to bow down and kiss the earth" — which is significant only as a literary attitude, only as part of an understanding which does not admit religion either as scripture or as moral imperative. Crime and Punishment is not properly within Christian terms. A peculiar kind of enthusiasm has distorted the actual relation between what we might call the book itself and its total vision.

The book is a study of the relations between an alienated individual and the social institutions with which he must deal to work out his life. In this sense, it is a modern novel, and it is this modernity which excites us when we first read the book. The detail impresses itself on us. We feel we discover our involvement in the nature of crime, and we become aware of the meaning of punishment. The impact of the book is the impact of crime.

Crime is a violation of a "public right," as Webster's puts it, a "gross violation of human law," "any evil act or sin." Given the condition of the alienation of man, any anti-institutional act is a criminal act, is anarchic. Rousseau said that the evil men do proceeds chiefly from the institutions they have established — that mankind is corrupted in civilization. More strongly, as Trotter put it (and as Dostoevskij analyzed it), both the good and the evil are in the same establishment: "... we seem almost forced to accept the dreadful hypothesis that in the very structure and

substance of all human constructive social efforts there is embodied a principle of death, . . . that the intellect can provide no permanent defence against a vigorous barbarism."¹ The conscience of the individual, his essential consistency, or what Marcuse calls his "most cherished moral agency, . . . [is] permeated with the death instinct."² The suppression by the super-ego is a self-destruction in socially useful activity. The greater the assertiveness of the ego, the greater, correspondingly, is the required repression. That is, "the very progress of civilization leads to the release of increasingly destructive forces."³ Human institutions arise to counteract these forces. Institutions both express opposition to archaic domination and enforce primal domination for the "good" of the whole society, even if the primal dominator himself be ultimately liable for what he has done. The experience of domination and the effort to overcome it is still necessarily part of civilized existence. From his own viewpoint, the individual — typically, Raskol'nikov (Dostoevskij is extremely careful to make Raskol'nikov not average, not normal, but typical) — has not forfeited his paradise by sinning against God, as the institutional taboo insists, but was deprived of his "paradise" — what was rightfully his — by the domination of his fellow man, who are themselves at least as guilty as he — if not more guilty. We enter Raskol'nikov's crime through this ambivalence. What Raskol'nikov does is what we are liable to — and for. In symbolic terms, there is no distinction between desire and fact, between temptation and act. So long as the repressed material returns, the individual is punished for what he has long since ceased even wanting to do. Raskol'nikov's story is actual.

Raskol'nikov's symbolic conception of the murder — "beforehand" — offers him, in his intense pride and desperation, that total freedom in which his dreams are presented as actualized. Murder itself becomes the necessary tool for asserting the extraordinary over the ordinary. Raskol'nikov becomes his crime, the oppression, the opposition, and the oppression of the opposition commingled in one life. The reorganization of his mind toward which the novel moves, outside the novel itself — that is, a description of effect — is given as a picture in the incredible (like a moral inappropriate to its fable) epilogue to the real book. The epilogue presents a world of composure which the

forces the book has unleashed declare absurd. What we come to understand is the meaning of the web of secret impulses of the man who does a violent act. The effort of the mind to re-order the tensions of confusion and the absence of any new order are the delimitations of Dostoevskij's attitude: that catastrophe and epiphany occur in the same moment through the same action, that the disaster and the discovery lie in the one "gesture." Suffering is the actual condition for salvation and, also, the source for the vision of salvation. In Christian terms, the crime is Sin and the punishment is Suffering — the solace, as Farnese put it to Dante — that leads to Grace. They are coincident (as the coincidences in this book emphasize). Neither occurs outside the other.

Apart from each other, neither is real — that is, there is neither crime nor punishment. When Raskol'nikov's sister Dunja shouts at him, pressing him to her and kissing him: "Aren't you, going to your suffering, washing off at least half your crime?" Raskol'nikov shouts suddenly in some sort of unexpected madness, "Crime? What crime?"⁴ The crime itself was expiation: he killed a foul, pernicious, and useless louse, "for killing which forty sins are forgiven."⁵ What by social standards is called crime may, by the very principles on which those standards are based, equally be called fulfillment of the law. The social shame to which Raskol'nikov considers himself obliged to submit — the expiation, as it were — is not a consequent of, or even an aspect of, the essence of the crime either as idea or as actual murder. The idea of the crime remains intact despite the murder, and the murder of the pawnbroker, like the superfluous murder of her sister, turns out to be not an enactment of the idea at all. In fact, the murder seemed to Raskol'nikov to have occurred in his mind before he committed it. The failure of the crime is neither ethical nor practical. The idea did not go bad; the murder came off, and the murderer was not detected. It failed aesthetically. It was not beautiful.⁶ It was not artful perfection of the idea; it provoked no immediate or disinterested pleasure, no moral exaltation; it was not an independent and self-subsistent product of the creative imagination. Far from stimulating delight in itself, it itself turned out to be liable to the same kind or quality of deformity which it was intended to reform. The idea and the act do not fit. Neither is appropriate to the other, although each, in its own terms,

seems to exist as the other. Theoretically, murder in the name of humanitarianism and progress seems necessary; practically, the wisdom of moral improvement is justice. The limitations of human life, however, deform either the concept or the act in the effort to perform both. This is what Raskol'nikov becomes aware of. About to submit to what he calls useless shame, he sees clearly, he says, "the whole absurdity of my cowardice.... I'm determined [to submit] simply because of my baseness and mediocrity...." He wanted the good for men, he says, "... and would have done hundreds, thousands of good deeds instead of this one stupidity, not even stupidity but simply blunder, since this whole idea was not at all so stupid as it now seems in failure ... (in failure everything seems stupid!).... But I, I did not sustain even the first step because I am — a no-good bastard! That's the whole problem!"⁷ Had he succeeded, he says, he would have been crowned; since he failed, he is in a trap. What he did is not at issue; how he did it has led directly to his catastrophe. That's not it at all, says Dunja. But Raskol'nikov insists sharply: "Ah! Not the proper form, not such an aesthetically beautiful form! Well, I absolutely don't understand: why is throwing bombs on people in regular siege a more respectable form? The fear of aesthetics is the first sign of weakness!... Never, never have I been more clearly aware of this than now, and more than ever I don't understand my crime!"⁸

What he understands, in one sense of the word, is that, in another sense, he cannot understand it. The idea does not fit, but there is no "reason" for its not fitting. Having lived to experience the fact of its inappropriateness — the mysterious discord engendered — Raskol'nikov finds the most sensible, the most significant, response is to assume that he, as agent, was the source of the distortion and to take on himself responsibility for the incongruity. This makes the incongruity corruption, and the crime not an imperfection but a sin. Having failed as an artist, precisely analogously to the way Dostoevskij is aware he himself is always liable to fail, Raskol'nikov is required to become, at least, a man.

The process of the book is, therefore, also a moral progress, the making of a hero, of a complete man.

He entered the courtyard rather briskly. He

had to go up to the third floor. "I've still the time going up," he thought. In general it seemed to him that the fatal minute was still remote, that a lot of time still remained, that he could still reconsider a lot of things.

Again the same litter, the same shells on the spiral stairs, again the doors of the apartments wide open, again the very same kitchens with their stink and fumes. Raskol'nikov had not been here since that time. His legs were becoming numb and buckling under him, but still went on. He stopped for a moment to catch his breath, to pull himself together, to enter as a man.⁹

The crime takes on power and meaning through symbols intimately revealing the violence of life and death. The drama of the book is the drama among images of the mind. The effort is to assert life by taking it.

The first condition of life, as presented by the novel, is humiliation, the stinking city in which human life hardly exists. This is where Raskol'nikov begins. He is involved with Marmeladov, ruined and foul, by interest, by pity and by necessity. He finds himself involuntarily in a Slough of Despond, which he knows he must go through in order to find himself really, but he does not know how to get through and doubts, in the great pride of his intellect, that he has the ability to get through finally. When he reads in his mother's letter that his sister Dunja is to marry Lužin — that she will do the ordinary thing, for him, that he cannot, the self-destructive compromise he will not allow himself — he knows he has lost all "reason" for existence. At that moment the idea of murder returns to his mind as if by itself as an independent necessity. It requires that he actualize it and thereby complete himself. The preparation for the murder is to allow it to mature, to allow the murderer and the victim to fall together, to be coincident.

Suddenly he shuddered: a certain, also yesterday's, idea again swept through his head. But he shuddered not because this idea swept through him. He really knew, he had a presentiment, that it would unfailingly "sweep through," and had been waiting for it. Indeed, this idea was not yesterday's at all. But the difference was that a month ago, and even only yesterday, it was only a dream, but now . . . now it appeared suddenly not as a dream but in some sort of new, terrible and to

him completely unfamiliar form, and he himself recognized this.¹⁰

The punishment begins after the murder when Raskol'nikov wakes up to find that the completion of the crime lies still ahead.

Raskol'nikov may get around Razumixin, who accepts actuality as it is, but he cannot get around the murder. He moves closer and closer to it from one level of intensity to another, descending into himself as Dante descended into Hell. As close as he comes to reaching that forgiveness which would obviate the necessity of crime is the dream of the horse which mankind killed because it could not pull mankind. The dream is an astounding analogy to reality: "In a morbid state, dreams are often notable for their unusual prominence, clarity, and extraordinary resemblance to actuality. Sometimes a monstrous picture is put together, but the setting and the whole process of the whole presentation are at the same time so probable and with such subtle, unexpected, but with the whole completeness of the picture artistically consistent details, that this very same dreamer could not have thought them up in his waking hours, even if he were such an artist as Puškin or Turgenev."¹¹ The book itself — literature — is the meeting ground of the dream and the actuality, is the reality and the possibilities as well. The supreme fiction is the most real story. Raskol'nikov has a "terrible dream." He dreams himself back to his original innocence in a symbolic act of sympathy for the oppressed. The dream ends in the moment of symbolic fulfillment, the kiss, a moment very much like the moment in which Christ kisses the Grand Inquisitor in The Brothers Karamazov. This is that ultimate moment in drama — in the real dream, or, as Ivan calls it, "poem" — in which good and evil are summed up and compounded in a single movement.

The vitality of the idea of murder is a product of the chain of coincidence Dostoevskij builds up. A feeling of inevitability is produced by emphasis on a series of arbitrary events outside a man's control that nevertheless determine him to act in a certain way. Coincidence heightens his awareness of the secret self within him which he can neither overtake nor escape. It is, for example, the irony of the coincidences after the murder that defines Raskol'nikov's isolation and forces himself on himself. Wandering through

St. Petersburg, along the Neva, seemingly aimlessly, consumed by revulsion at the sight of all the people, buildings and shapes around him, Raskol'nikov suddenly finds himself right next to Razumixin's house: " . . . How's this, that in no way did I myself come to Razumixin's! Again the same story, as then, when . . . But however it's very curious: did I myself come, or was I just going along and dropped in here? Doesn't matter; I said . . . two days ago . . . that I would go to his place the day after that, well, so, I will!"¹² He finds Razumixin finishing translating a pamphlet called Is Woman a Human Being?, work on which Razumixin offers to share with Raskol'nikov, and about to take up translating scandalous pieces from Rousseau's Confessions. Later, on the way home, Raskol'nikov is whipped by a coachman and given a bit of money by a woman who pities him, thinking him a beggar. He throws the money in the Neva. The irony of the woman question, the confessions, the useless and contemptible money and, finally, the days of fever and delirium — all are marks of Raskol'nikov's mindlessness following the murder. They are the separate and respectable equivalents to the elements of the crime, the means for re-dramatizing it, like that "awkward, white flower" on the "dirty, yellow wallpaper" which Raskol'nikov, lying on his bed and listening to Razumixin report what is known about the murder, picks off with his finger when he hears that "Lizaveta, too, was murdered!"

Raskol'nikov pursues his crime to catch himself, to re-enact the murder in order to possess himself. He uses friends, the police, the total environment to act out in his mind what he has done imperfectly and cannot complete until it is composed in his mind. All the real-life details — the wallpaper, the sock, the tavern whores, the horse, the river, the girl on the street, the newspaper — take on symbolic function by Raskol'nikov's dramatization of them, a dramatization in which he continues to play a role he knows is false. Like Hamlet's, it is the self-assumed role of the extraordinary man by which he intends to make his life valid, to prevent the success of the incoherence, the decomposition, which he feels threatens his personality. When finally the idea of the murder has become so enormous that it overwhelms him, he has come to himself.

The novel takes place in a setting of normality. The characters around Raskol'nikov are not so much characters

as positions. Even their exaggerations or eccentricities are stereotypes, rather than significant idiosyncrasies — for example, the posturing of Lužin, or Raskol'nikov's mother's devotion. The other characters are points or moment of a circle around Raskol'nikov's idea of himself. He moves through the circle to return to himself. The ultimate corruption, or abnormality, is the figure of Svidrigajlov, representative of that dark and destructive "other" self suppressed in normal life. His power — its power — is the contamination that is temptation. Even when the temptation is consummated, as Dunja consummates it by aiming the revolver at Svidrigajlov, one knows nothing about the commitment except that it is or is not complete. What the power means is always beyond understanding. It is mystery, as Svidrigajlov is in this novel and as Stavrogin in The Possessed was meant to be.

Svidrigajlov is not a "double" to Raskol'nikov. Rather, he is the man in the cellar, the nadir of Raskol'nikov's circle. Porfirij analogously is the zenith, the reasoning self, that part of Raskol'nikov who wrote the article and invented the crime in the first place, that master thinker, that agent of plot who knows all about the murder but who, having no faith (and no morals), cannot complete the crime.

The simultaneous development of the crime and of the punishment follows from the Christian concept that the actor can never complete his act (that the meaning of an act does not lie within the act itself) and from the reciprocal relations between Raskol'nikov and the set of characters around him. The characters in conflict become dramatized by being depicted as opposites, that is, by taking on, apart from their actual interdependence, mutual delimitation and definition, contrasting intellectual positions. The closer these characters are brought together the more disparate they appear. Dostoevskij focusses on those actual moments when the mind hangs between attracting contraries.

These moments are played off against other, analogous moments. They are made to seem typical by being given so much attention (the importance of detail) or by being defined (the "elemental" conflict, the rational superstructure of the novel), but their meaning lies within the dramatic network of their relationships. Both Sonja and Raskol'nikov, for example, dislocated by perverse uses of love, work through each other toward accepting that renunciation of self which,

like the idea of the crime, must, if it comes at all, come as if in spite of itself. It is the disparity of their positions that allows each to complete the other's: Raskol'nikov to be the vehicle for Sonja's dedication, Sonja to be the agent from whom Rasdol'nikov may learn to accept the prison of love. He respects life too much to accept it as it is; he must learn to accept, at least, the love.

Raskol'nikov finally goes to confess as a man. God is still beyond him, still outside the book. The book cannot encompass the completion that is atonement because it is limited by actuality to social institutions, and there is no actual institution, Dostoevskij indicates, through which an individual can reach God. The individual must move, as Sonja suggests in the purity of her humiliation, by imitation, by, we may say, aesthetic principles. The individual himself creates his guilt: that is the crime. Its measure is faith which, if deep enough, allows a man to transform himself through purgation of the self-engendered guilt. To live is to walk the knife-edge between imprisonment and freedom. Only by rebelling against the condition of activity and by transforming the rebellion through the symbols into an act of faith can a man, as if in imitation of Christ, taking on himself all actual guilt, resume his original, extraordinary dignity. Because the transformation is outside any possible social structure, the contradictions within the rebellion remain, forcing it always to be ultimately self-consuming. There is no way out of these contradictions except death.

Notes

1. Wilfred Trotter, Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War (London, 1953), pp. 196-197.

2. Herbert Marcuse, Eros and Civilization (Boston, 1955), p. 53.

3. Ibid., p. 54.

4. F. M. Dostoevskij, Prestuplenie i nakazanie [Crime and Punishment], Sobranie sočinenii [Collected Works], V (Moskva, 1957), 542.

5. Ibid.

6. "Crime by its nature is ugly. Crimes, no matter what they may be, are more, so to speak, picturesque and imposing

the more blood and horror there is; but there are crimes that by their nature are shameful, disgraceful, beyond any justification by horror...." Tixon to Stavrogin, "U Tixona" [At Tixon's], Besy [The Possessed], Polnoe sobranie xudožestvennyx proizvedenij [Complete Collected Works] (Moskva-Leningrad, 1927), VII, 582.

7. Crime and Punishment, p. 543.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid., p. 551.
10. Ibid., p. 51.
11. Ibid., p. 59.
12. Ibid., p. 117.

"THE FATALIST" AS A KEYSTONE OF
A HERO OF OUR TIMES

By John Mersereau, Jr.

University of Michigan

The role of "The Fatalist" has not been widely treated in the critical literature pertaining to A Hero of Our Times. For the most part, commentators have restricted themselves to pointing out that chronologically the events in this final story of the novel take place roughly at the same time as those recounted in "Bèla," the initial tale. Apparently it has been assumed that Lermontov, in placing "The Fatalist" at the end of his work, simply intended to exploit the possibility of adding an element of form by thus closing the temporal circle. Having pointed this out, commentators have then proceeded to discuss "The Fatalist" as a completely separate entity, oblivious of those ties which bind the story to the preceding ones and which justify its position as the conclusion of the novel.

This failure to reveal the vital role of "The Fatalist" in A Hero of Our Times and to demonstrate convincingly its raison d'être as the work's conclusion has left Lermontov open to the criticism that he was inept in his handling of the novel form. It has even been stated that A Hero of Our Times is not a novel at all, but simply a series of stories united by the figure of their common hero.¹ This opinion has been further encouraged by the fact that parts of the work were published separately in Notes of the Fatherland in 1839 and 1840, prior to the appearance of the complete work in the latter year. "Bèla" and "The Fatalist" both appeared, in that order, in 1839, and "Taman'" was also separately published shortly before the entire work came out in the two-volume first edition.²

The fact that the publication of "The Fatalist" preceded that of the complete work does suggest that it was written before Lermontov decided to combine his stories into a novel. Following this line of reasoning, some have assumed

SEEJ, New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII) (1960)

that this tale was not intentionally designed as the conclusion of the novel but merely given this role subsequently when the author arranged his stories for publication as a single work. Such an assumption must be challenged, for, although very little is known about the time of composition of the various stories making up A Hero of Our Times, we do have some clues which indicate that "The Fatalist" was written only after Lermontov had decided to create a novel.

First, "Bèla" must certainly have been written before "The Fatalist," as the latter story closes with the scene in which Maksim Maksimyč appears to provide an ironical conclusion to the theme of predestination. Since at this appearance Maksim Maksimyč is simply mentioned by name and not further identified, it is evident that the author expected the reader would know to whom he was referring. The only possible way the reader could know this is through "Bèla," and hence this work must already have been completed. It goes without saying that the episode entitled "Maksim Maksimyč" was also written after "Bèla," as it is obviously a pendant to "Bèla" and is significant only in connection with what has previously been learned of the relationship between Pečorin and Maksim Maksimyč. Further, the manuscript of "Maksim Maksimyč" bears the epigraph "... and they did meet," which manifestly refers to the statement in the concluding paragraph of "Bèla," "We did not expect ever to meet again, yet we did meet. . . ." ³

The two other stories having a place in A Hero of Our Times, "Taman'" and "Princess Mary," provide no real evidence that they were written after "Bèla." However, there is one good indication that when writing "The Fatalist" Lermontov had either completed these two tales or had planned their place in his novel, for on the manuscript of "The Fatalist" is the heading "Notebook III." ⁴ As we know, "The Fatalist" is the third of the notebooks forming Pečorin's Journal, "Taman'" and "Princess Mary" being the first and second. The heading "Notebook III" would have been entirely arbitrary and meaningless had Lermontov not already had in mind the two preceding ones.

It is evident, therefore, that although "The Fatalist" was published before the appearance of the novel itself, it was written after the major portions of the work had, at the very least, been planned in some detail. Hence, Lermontov must certainly have formed his intention to present his

collection of stories as a novel and was well aware that this story was to serve as the conclusion.

If, as seems plausible from the foregoing, "The Fatalist" was consciously conceived to serve as the conclusion of a novel involving Pečorin, we are obliged to seek within this story some elements which would particularly justify Lermontov's having placed it in this important position.

It has already been noted that the usual explanation is connected with the chronological coincidence of "Bèla" and "The Fatalist." This in itself would not suffice to justify the latter's cardinal position. That Lermontov so located it because he thought it technically or artistically the best selection must also be dismissed, for it is in no way superior to the preceding parts. The plot is certainly not more absorbing than that of "Bèla," "Taman'," or "Princess Mary." As for Vulič, the new character introduced here, he is only sketchily developed, particularly when compared to other secondary figures of the novel, such as Grušnickij or Maksim Maksimych. Nor does "The Fatalist" reveal anything essentially new with respect to Pečorin's personality: the story only reiterates those qualities of audaciousness and contentiousness which the reader has already come to associate with him.

The only commentator who has dealt in more than a cursory manner with the problem of the ties between "The Fatalist" and the preceding parts of A Hero of Our Times has been E. N. Mixajlova. In her recent (1957) book, The Prose of Lermontov, she construes "The Fatalist" as a call for action in the face of a social and historical determinism which has led to passive acceptance of the status quo:

Action, battle — that is Lermontov's final conclusion on the problem of fate. If predestination exists, then one may hazard the most senseless and dangerous acts, as does Vulič; if predestination does not exist or if it is possible to doubt its existence, then action is all the more obligatory, as in the case of Pečorin, who tests fate. Thus, the idea of determinism, even when carrying it to a fatalistic interpretation, does not suppress the spirit of action of Lermontov's work and the activity of his hero.⁵

Such an interpretation, even if true, completely ignores the much more important role which this story plays in the novel. After all, A Hero of Our Times is a work in which

the primary emphasis is upon the delineation of the hero's personality. The structure of the novel itself indicates this, the chronology obviously being manipulated to provide the reader an increasingly clearer image of the personality of the hero. The problem, then, is to determine in what way "The Fatalist" assists in bringing the image of this personality into final focus. Mixajlova's comments in no way elucidate this matter.

The title itself, "The Fatalist," suggests the area in which we must search to find the significance of this story in connection with the novel as a whole. Indeed, it is the treatment of the theme of fate and Pečorin's relationship to this theme which explain Lermontov's having designated this story to conclude his novel.

The theme of fate is found directly expressed in all of the parts forming the novel except "Maksim Maksimych." In Pečorin's Journal, especially, it acquires increasing importance with each succeeding page, culminating in the final tale.

In "Bèla" this theme is necessarily restricted by the character of the principal narrator, Maksim Maksimych, for whom a preoccupation with fate or a discussion of its role in life would be unrealistic. Therefore the only direct reference, other than Maksim Maksimych's comment that there really exist people who at birth are destined to extraordinary experiences, occurs in the speech of Pečorin in answer to the old veteran's criticism of his indifference to Bèla: "When I saw Bèla in my own house, when for the first time, holding her on my knees, I kissed her black locks, I, fool that I was, thought that she was an angel, sent to me by a compassionate fate." In the context of "Bèla" itself, the remark is apparently casual, but when considered from a point of view of the novel as a whole, it acquires real importance: it is the first link in a long chain of revelations about Pečorin's attitude toward fate and free will.

Pečorin's observation here about the role of fate in his affair with Bèla is made only after the handwriting is on the wall and he has realized that his love for her is transitory. In his interpretation he had erred in believing that fate arranged the affair with Bèla as a compensation for previous unhappiness. But this is the extent of the responsibility he assumes. Obviously, in his opinion he is as much a victim as she, and he completely ignores the fact that it was he,

through the vigorous exercise of his own will, who brought about Bèla's abduction and who forced her to acquiesce to his physical and emotional control. Whereas Pečorin might with justification have considered his original meeting with Bèla an act of fate, it was he alone who determined to have her kidnapped, employing all the resources at his command to bring the girl to submission. Characteristically, however, he implies that it is fate which is to blame.

In "Taman'" the pattern is repeated. Following his almost disastrous misadventure, Pečorin asks: "And why did fate cast me into this peaceful circle of honest smugglers? Like a stone thrown into the calm waters of a spring, I had disturbed their tranquility, and like a stone I almost sank to the bottom myself!" Whereas Pečorin might with some justification have accused fate of having brought him to Taman', he had only himself to blame for his introduction into the circle of smugglers and the outcome of his experience with them. He could easily have avoided the threat to his life had he not "resolved to find the key to this riddle" and spied upon the activities of the blind boy and his accomplices. His subsequent interrogation of the blind boy, cross-examination of the undine and threat to report her to the authorities, and the midnight tryst with the girl were not the result of necessity but the consequences of his own curiosity, love of adventure, and desire to make his presence felt by all those with whom he came into contact. But characteristically, as in "Bèla," when the interference of Pečorin in the affairs of others comes to a near-tragic conclusion, fate is once more made the scapegoat.

"Princess Mary" is rich in passages concerned with Pečorin's belief in fate. When he first learns from Doctor Werner that Mary is interested in Grušnickij, he declares with delight: "There's a plot . . . we'll make some efforts to bring about the dénouement of this comedy. Obviously fate is taking care that I won't be bored." Yet his whole subsequent behavior towards Grušnickij and Princess Mary (except for the brief moment when he suspects he may be in love with the girl) is not that of one who is an agent of fate but of one who unceasingly strives to direct their lives in accordance with his personal will. When the thralls of his will are rebellious, his efforts to dominate them are intensified and a threatening tone is sounded: "But I have found you out, dear princess. Watch out! You want to pay me

back in the same coin, to prick my vanity. You won't succeed! And if you declare war on me, then I will be merciless."

In his most introspective moments Pečorin is quite able to see in its true light his motivation in seeking to subject Mary and Grušnickij to his control: "... my ambition has been stifled by circumstances, but it has manifested itself in another form, because ambition is nothing but a thirst for power, and my chief pleasure — the subjugation to my will of everything that surrounds me, the excitation of feelings towards me of love, devotion and fear — is this not the chief indication and the greatest triumph of power?"

This fluctuation in Pečorin's thinking — his casting of himself alternately in the role of a tool of fate or in the role of a force which can subject to his will all that surrounds him — is emphasized again as he chronicles the development of the "comedy." In the entry under "June 5th," we read: "Is it possible, I thought, that my only function on earth is to destroy the hopes of others? Ever since I have been living and acting, somehow fate has always led me to the dénouement of the dramas of others, as if no one could die or come to despair without me. I was the indispensable character of the fifth act. Involuntarily I have played the wretched role of the executioner or betrayer. What aim did fate have in this?"

In the same entry, juxtaposed to this rationalization of his "fated" destructive effect on others, we find Pečorin asserting that the zest of life consists in actively frustrating the plans of his enemies, feigning defeat in order to triumph more decisively at the moment when his opponents think their victory is certain: "To be always on guard, to catch every glance, the meaning of every word, to guess intentions, to frustrate plots, to pretend to be deceived and then suddenly with one blow to upset the whole huge and elaborate edifice of artifice and schemes — that's what I call life!" It is apparent from this that the whole relationship between Pečorin, Grušnickij and Mary is not a simple "comedy" staged by fate but a drama in which Pečorin intends to be playwright, director, and hero. The cadet and the princess are allowed a certain freedom in developing the plot, but only in order that Pečorin shall more deeply enjoy the satisfaction of facing them with an unexpected dénouement in which their roles will be rigidly specified. Yet sensing beforehand that the "comedy" will become a tragedy, Pečorin absolves

himself from the responsibility by posing as a persona of the fifth act who must perform as fate directs.

The penultimate entry in Pečorin's chronicle, written in the sleepless hours before his duel with Grušnickij, again is concerned with fate and its function in the "comedy," which by now approaches the final act. Aware of Grušnickij's intention of shaming him publicly by means of the rigged duel, Pečorin asserts: "Ah, Mr. Grušnickij, your mystification will not be successful. We will exchange roles. . . ." His plan is to insist that he and Grušnickij cast lots to determine who will receive the first shot, further stipulating conditions such that the one who wins the toss will be assured of killing his adversary. Thus, in Pečorin's opinion, the decision of life or death will be left entirely to fate. This point is reiterated in the epilogue: "I wanted to give myself the complete right not to spare him if fate gave me a reprieve." As Pečorin intends, he does exchange roles with Grušnickij, and, with his rival lying dead on the jagged rocks below the duelling site, he declares cynically: "Finita la commedia!" The dénouement has been achieved.

The evidence of "Bèla," "Taman'," and "Princess Mary" substantiates an interpretation that Pečorin is undecided in his attitude toward fate. When life proceeds in such a way as not to excite his conscience, he is pleased to believe that he is in command of his own and other's destinies. He actively seeks to shape events in order to realize his ambition of power over others: " . . . my chief pleasure — the subjugation to my will of everything that surrounds me. . . ." But when his interference in the lives of others leads to tragedy, he assuages his conscience by putting the blame on fate.

In "The Fatalist" a further illumination of Pečorin's attitude toward fate is achieved by a revealing investigation of his uncertainty about the validity of the concept of predestination. He admits that following Vulič's dramatic "proof" he was temporarily convinced: "I do not know for certain whether I now believe in predestination or not, but on that evening I firmly believed in it: the proof was striking, and I, despite my having laughed at our ancestors with their obliging astrology, had involuntarily fallen into their track. But I stopped myself in time on this dangerous path and, having a rule never to disclaim anything absolutely nor to believe blindly in anything, I cast metaphysics aside. . . ."

The subsequent events of that same night provide Pečorin with a chance to perform his own experiment: "... like Vulič, I thought to test fate." Significantly, after his test he is no more a fatalist than he was prior to it: "After all this, how, it would seem, could one not become a fatalist? But who knows for certain whether he is convinced of something or not? And how often we accept as a conviction that which is a delusion of our senses or an error in reasoning!"⁶ These are the concluding thoughts of Pečorin on the theme of fate, and they clearly indicate that whatever transitory belief he might have had in fatalism, in the final analysis he was completely skeptical.

In the opening paragraphs of "The Fatalist" Lermontov makes it quite clear that a firm belief or disbelief in fate as an agent determining man's actions is of vital ethical importance. One of the officers present at the gathering where Vulič's test takes place declares: "And precisely if there is such a thing as predestination, then why have we been given will, judgment? Why must we give account for our actions?" Here the point is made — and note that these are not Pečorin's words — that if one does not accept predestination, then he must accept responsibility for his acts. Pečorin does neither. Seen in the light of his doubts about the verity of predestination, Pečorin's previously disclosed statements that he was an involuntary tool of fate become sheer casuistry. He has no real conviction that fate plays a role in his life, and in fact he continually employs all the powers at his disposal to prove just the opposite — that he is a free agent who through his innate superiority is able to plot the lives of others. Such being the case, his occasional recourse to a belief in the power of fate is an act of self deception, a convenient way to blame an exterior power for the tragic results of the exercise of his will.

"The Fatalist" obviously deserves its position as the conclusion of A Hero of Our Times, for it provides what is logically the final "key" to the enigma of Pečorin. Whereas the preceding stories are primarily concerned with revealing the nature of his life and personality, this tale endeavors to answer the question of why he acted as he did. In "The Fatalist" Lermontov establishes the point that the alternative to a belief in fatalism is the acceptance of free will and the responsibility that it entails. Pečorin rejects fatalism in favor of free will, as this is more gratifying to

his ego, but he refuses the burden of responsibility. With the revelation of this moral deficiency, it becomes finally clear why his life is essentially aimless and often destructive. The hero's innate intelligence and dynamism combine to give him unusual personal power, but this power is neither restrained nor directed by any conviction of responsibility: his only imperatīves are those dictated to him by his passions.

It is scarcely necessary to emphasize the importance which "The Fatalist" acquires once its total content has been understood. Seen in its proper perspective, the story not only assumes its rightful place as a keystone in the thematic structure of A Hero of Our Times, thus resolving any doubts as to its role in the novel, but it also lends additional meaning to the novel as a whole. Is not the problem of freedom and responsibility, which is brought to the fore in "The Fatalist," one of the problems occupying existentialist philosophers and writers at this very moment? It is true that Lermontov did not concentrate exclusively upon this matter in his novel; however, with a delicate poetic touch he developed the theme of freedom and responsibility through his entire work, bringing it to a culmination in his final story. Lermontov did not and would not didactically emphasize his occupation with this theme, because he was a poet and confident that his work could speak for itself. But, as he says in his Introduction to the second edition, "Our public is still so young and naive that it fails to understand a fable unless it finds a lesson at its end." As a concession to this public he set up an obvious signboard: the title to the last story, which is, moreover, the only title for any of the five tales forming the novel which was not based on a proper name. Unfortunately, this signboard was ignored and Pečorin's conflict between fate and free will overlooked, with the result that one of the significant universalistic aspects of A Hero of Our Times has remained unnoticed for over a century.

Notes

1. The most recent expression of this opinion was made by V. Nabokov in an article entitled "The Lermontov Mirage," in which he stated: "First of all, The Hero of Our Times is

not really a novel at all, but a group of five short stories." Russian Review, I (November, 1941), p. 36. In all fairness to this commentator, it should be noted that in the Introduction to his recent translation of the work Mr. Nabokov does not reiterate this point and uses the term "novel" without qualification when speaking of Lermontov's work. Cf. A Hero of Our Time: A Novel by Mihail Lermontov, translated by Vladimir Nabokov in collaboration with Dmitri Nabokov (New York: Doubleday, 1958), pp. v-xix.

2. Cf. V. A. Manujlov, editor, Materialy dlja bibliografii Lermontova (Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1936), I, 19-21.

3. Lermontov, Sočinenija v šesti tomach (Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1957), VI, 565.

4. Ibid., p. 607.

5. E. N. Mikhajlova, Proza Lermontova (Moskva: Gos. izdat. xudožestvennoj literatury, 1957), pp. 339-340.

6. That Lermontov deliberately wished to emphasize Pečorin's ambivalent attitude towards fate is indicated by the fact that he removed from his manuscript a sentence in which Pečorin asserted that fate had unquestionably intervened in Vulič's test with the pistol. Lermontov, op. cit., p. 610. The significance of this deletion has been noted by Durylin, Geroj našego vremeni M. Ju. Lermontova (Moskva: Gos. Učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdat. Narkomprosa RSFSR, 1940), p. 253.

FORM AND STYLE IN THE LETTERS OF ALEKSANDR PUŠKIN

By J. T. Shaw

Indiana University

Puškin's letters are generally recognized as being among the finest — most would probably say the finest — in Russian; they are regarded as comprising one of his literary master-works, and some would say his best work in prose.¹ His correspondence is that of a man of the world and of letters, reacting to life, literature, and events in a crucial period of modern Russian history. In his letters, unlike Horace Walpole, he is not deliberately the historian of his time. Nevertheless, Puškin's place in Russian life and literature and the range of his acquaintances and interests are such that the letters have been properly called an encyclopedia of contemporary Russian life and literature. In addition, the letters provide the best source for tracing the personality and development, the inner and external biography of Russia's greatest poet.

Puškin was conscious of letters as a literary genre and of the merits of his own. His letters were so highly esteemed in his own day that several of them were printed wholly or in part — to his indignation — without his consent.² He himself proposed the publication of his correspondence with his friend Del'vig, after the latter's death.³ About one letter, Puškin half-jokingly commented to his wife: "... I am dispatching it to you, so that not a single line of my pen may be lost, either for you or for posterity."⁴ Puškin's letters are in a real sense literary creations, in that, like everything he wrote, they reflect his artistic conscience and were composed, often with rough drafts and variants, like his creative works. As with his creative works, he had strong feelings as to his own right to dictate the time and conditions of publication. He also realized that his letters provided the workshop where for the first time a satisfactory Russian prose language was developed.

About three-fourths of Puškin's letters are written in Russian, and the remainder are in French, the language of polite society and the court. Puškin himself confessed that he found it easier to converse or to correspond with ladies and also to write on general subjects in French than in Russian. Thus his ideas on the dramatic theory embodied in Boris Godunov⁵ and on Russian history and society in the letters to Čaadaev were expressed in French.⁶ The official letters were written either in Russian or French, with no marked difference in manner or contents. He wrote to women, except his wife, almost exclusively in French; all of his letters to her while she was his fiancée are in French, except one in Russian "because I don't know how to scold in French."⁷ After their marriage, he wrote to her only in Russian. Puškin's French is the slightly formal conventional language of the French-speaking Russian aristocracy. He was at home in these conventions, and he used them with charm, flexibility, and power, and with a breadth of range and variety of effects. But the intimate, homely, familiar letters are all in Russian, and Russian was the language of the personal correspondence on matters of life and literature. His French possesses a slightly old-fashioned charm, the reflection of a society that is no more. His Russian is as fresh and immediate today as when he wrote it.

Puškin's correspondence falls into two main categories, with an appropriate style and form for each. One group is composed of the official letters, addressed not only to governmental functionaries, but to two tsars. The other group, the great preponderance of his correspondence, is made up of personal letters, in which the personal may be mingled, in various proportions, with matters of literary and social interest.

The major portion of the official letters were addressed to Count Benkendorf for showing, if he wished, to Nicholas I. By the nature of official correspondence, they show comparatively little variety, but each is worth careful reading, in juxtaposition with the personal letters of the same time, for what it reveals of Puškin's life and inner biography. How carefully they were composed is shown by the fact that for none of the other letters are there so many rough drafts and textual revisions. The official letters are correct, formal, and impersonal in tone, following the official amenities, but noteworthy in their brevity, severity in form, and lack

of flattery, fulsomeness, or subservience. In Puškin's personal crises, their conciseness verges upon dryness. He often takes full advantage of the conventional formal opening and complimentary close to cover up his actual feelings. He was able to maintain his self-respect in all the circumstances which required official letters of petition or self-justification; as he said of one of them, "there is nothing low in the deed [of writing the letter] or the expression."⁸

Though the official letters "in three-concerned hat and shoes"⁹ have their importance in Puškin's biography, his real quality is shown in the personal and personal-literary correspondence. The personal letters are like the lyrics in their saturation, their succinctness, and the immediacy of their presentation of thought and feeling. Though the letters are never lyrical — Puškin's prose, epistolary or otherwise, is never "poetic" — they may be compared with the lyrics in their revelation of his thought, feeling, and development. And he often permits them to reflect much more of the momentary, the individual, and the private than the artistic works.

The letters have a broad variety in style and expressiveness. They range from the burning, mad passion of the love letters to Mme. Kern,¹⁰ to the coldly insulting hatred of those to Heeckeren;¹¹ from warm, friendly banter to scintillating brilliance; from colloquial everyday prose to gravely respectful or even severe utterance; from "spleen," or melancholy, to rapture, from blunt plain-spokenness to formal correctness; from direct statement to wit, humor, and parody. Puškin thought that the "first task of a man of intelligence is to know whom he is dealing with":¹² the intellectual, social, and literary level and tastes of his correspondents and also his own relationships with them are implicit, not only in the substance, but also in the tone and style of the letters.

But with all their variety, the letters have basic qualities in common. One of them is an extreme brevity and tight construction. The average length is some two hundred fifty words, and the greater portion of them consist of only one paragraph. Puškin comes immediately to the point, makes terse comments on each of the principal heads of the letter being answered or of matters of mutual interest at the moment, and concludes crisply. The beginning may be

striking and effective — an announcement, a literary allusion, a folk expression — and the conclusion is often similarly striking and pithy. He moves from one topic to another with little or no transition; the thread of connection is provided by the successive points of the letter being answered or by a relationship between one topic and the next, suggested to him by it. He uses juxtaposition to indicate relationships, and a new paragraph to indicate a basic change in thought or tone or a break in rhythm. There are few postscripts. In a few cases, there are epigraphs, and in others fold expressions or literary allusions form a thread that binds the letter together. The unity of the letter is in the single presentation of the immediate complex of thoughts and feelings which make up the contents.

No English author has used such a naked, saturated style as that of Puškin's artistic prose or his letters. His sentence structure is stark in its simplicity: it is based on the brief simple clause, made up predominantly of noun and verb, with few adjectives and sparing use of subordinate clauses. The result is a dynamic style characterized by immediacy, swiftness, an impatient nervousness, and by abrupt sentences which, in rapid rhythm, point toward an idea, without bothering to spell it out in detail. His terseness often approaches the telegraphic, as he gives only the main heads of his judgments, leaving amplification and further discussion for later "leisure." The expression of feeling is curt and even severe; it never spills over into sentimentality or mawkishness. His vigorous phrase, in Russian or in French, often tends toward the epigrammatic: "Truly I love poetry without a plan better than a plan without poetry";¹³ "I cannot have confidence in Mixail or Penkovskij, seeing that I know the first and do not know the second."¹⁴ At the same time, the prose is flexible; he moves easily, from one letter to another or within a single letter, to the expression of a wide range of tone and of ideas and emotions. Puškin's style in the letters shows finish — not that of "literariness" or an effort at smoothness or gracefulness or elegance, but that of an artistic consciousness for which the curve of expression and the rhythm of phrase are a part of the thing expressed. And the effect is one of ease and unconstraint.

Puškin's letters to his personal friends who are also men of letters — such as Vjazemskij — sparkle with

fireworks which are not to be found elsewhere in his works. His comments, always brief and pointed, here tend toward the pithy, witty, aphoristic phrase: "anonymous (a kind of journalistic onanism)";¹⁵ a ventriloquist is "a very noteworthy person (or even persons)."¹⁶ His letters to literary friends are full of puns and play on words: "The devil take [publishing] Onegin!" exclaimed Puškin in exile; "I want to publish, or release, myself into the world."¹⁷ If a double meaning can be read into his words, one can be confident that it is intentionally there. Often young Puškin's wit represents what can be said on a subject — especially sex and religion — rather than necessarily his own considered opinions at the time: "Marriage castrates the soul,"¹⁸ he wrote in May 1826, only five months before he himself made a proposal of marriage. The letters are saturated with literary allusions and with quotations, often from Puškin's own works, and not infrequently ironic. He often twists quotations or allusions to make a particular application. He seldom cites the exact or full title of a work, including his own, but substitutes a key word or the name of a character. Humor, recognition, and even criticism are often present in the form of the citation as well as in the direct comment. There are relatively few figures of speech, but when they appear they tend to be more striking and pungent than in the artistic works: he found publishing a journal in Russia "all the same thing as honey-bucketing . . . ; to clean up Russian literature means to clean out privies . . ." ¹⁹

Particular effects are given in several letters by the use of parody. On occasion, Puškin simply takes off the ordinary literary style, as in the following passage to Del'vig: "I report to you, my master, that the present autumn has been procreative, and that if your humble vassal does not croak of the Saracen's epizootic, the cholera by name, brought back by the Crusaders, i. e., the Volga boatmen, then in your castle The Literary Gazette the songs of the troubadors will not become silent the whole year round."²⁰ Several of the letters are humorous "Arzamasian protocols,"²¹ parodying the decorousness of the old-fashioned Shishkovites. Puškin was only amused at the insistence that literature be solemn. His own prose style was developed, not in opposition to that of the followers of Šiškov, but to that of the Arzamasian followers of Karamzin — and their French masters — who, in aiming for elegance and "good taste"

tended toward excessive sweetness and to ornamental or euphemistic periphrasis: "and do not forget (to speak like Delille) the twisted steel which pierces the bepitched neck of the bottle — i. e., a corkscrew." ²²

Perhaps in part as a reaction against the periphrases and the cloying sentimentality of the Karamzinists, there can be a striking bluntness and directness of speech in the style of the letters, especially the familiar ones. Puškin felt that a "certain biblical obscenity" should remain in the language. ²³ He always used "with child" (brjuxataja) instead of the polite "pregnant" (beremennaja). There is a continuing repetition of the single most vigorous obscene expression in Russian; in one of his best-known short poems, "The Cart of Life" (Telega žizni), one line is left incomplete for the reader to supply this unprintable phrase. Nor does Puškin hesitate to speak of anatomy and natural functions in the Russian equivalents of the English four-letter words, not only in letters to his men friends, but also to his wife. This non-euphemistic terminology is occasionally also applied to the creative process.

In the early letters as in the early poems, there is a sprinkling of mythological allusions, not infrequently with ironic overtones. Thus Puškin's letter on his trip to the Caucasus and the Crimea begins "from the eggs of Leda." ²⁴ But, as in the poetry, mythology is replaced more and more by idiomatic folk expressions and proverbs. A whole letter is built on sam s'eš' "you're one yourself." ²⁵ The use of folk sayings in keeping with the homely, simple tone which came to be more and more characteristic of his familiar letters. The value which Puškin grew to find in folk wisdom is shown in his letter attempting to comfort Sobolevskij upon the death of the latter's mother: it is made up of proverbs. ²⁶

The vocabulary of the Russian letters has a wide variety, from the ordinary language of his time and class, to the literary language, to the use of antiquated or high-flown words for the sake of parody, to homely folk expressions. Few of the words and expressions used by him have become archaic. Puškin does not hesitate to use Gallicisms, especially in his early years, for concepts or expressions for which Russian did not provide satisfactory equivalents. There is a sprinkling of words with special literary or social connotations from still other languages, especially

Latin and English; the main English words used include "vulgar," "gentleman," "spleen," "rout," "bluestocking," and "quarterly." Puškin quotes conversations in the language in which they occurred, and thus not infrequently shifts from French to Russian, or vice versa, within a letter. Puškin expects his reader to catch the exact feeling he gives to particular words. And occasionally his words become endowed with new, special meanings: for example, "ravings" (bred) are the result of poetic inspiration, and "talking nonsense" (vrat') refers to his own friendly chatter.

There is a continuing play of irony, usually on what the ordinary or over-practical or unpoetic man would think or do. At first glance it may sometimes appear to be cynicism and to have been meant to be taken at face value — and indeed not only Puškin's acquaintances, but scholars and critics to this day, seem often to miss the point: for example, when he speaks of himself with bitter irony as "humble" or "bourgeois." In a moment of impatient anger he could apply to himself the motto ubi bene, ibi patria;²⁷ that this motto reflected the real attitude of the despicable journalist-spy and Polish renegade Bulgarin was perhaps Puškin's strongest charge against him.²⁸ Occasionally the irony is elusive and may be completely missed unless one senses the smile in the tone of the passage or catches the allusion: "... console me; that is the sacred duty of friendship (that sacred feeling)."²⁹ Puškin sometimes covers genuine feeling with ironic hyperbole, which he may have meant to be misinterpreted: "First love is always an affair of emotion: the sillier it is, the more delightful memories it leaves. The second, do you see, is an affair of voluptuousness.... Natalia ... is my one hundred thirteenth love ... "³⁰ He can go so far as to expect to be taken at face value in a completely ironic letter to a third-rate writer whom he has "defended."³¹

Puškin often uses another device for misleading the spying postal employes, if not his correspondents: "Aesopic language" — political or personal allusions hidden under apparently innocent or neutral expressions. Thus he referred to Alexander I in apparent allusion to ancient Roman rulers;³² in a number of letters to his wife, Puškin alluded to Nicholas I as "he."³³ When exiled Puškin contemplated flight abroad, he devised for his letters code words to cover plans and contingencies.³⁴ Puškin either identified

an anagram or code word for Countess Voroncova, or else her handwriting, as is shown by Puškin's recently discovered letter to her.³⁵ Puškin occasionally used Aesopic language in his artistic works: he refers to contemporary allusions concealed in Boris Godunov.³⁶ The government under Nicholas I became extremely sensitive to hidden meanings in literary works, and Puškin was obliged to defend his poetry — sometimes speciously — against such interpretations.³⁷

Puškin loved anecdotes; his brief diary is made up mainly of them, and there are many in his correspondence. They range from the literary to the social to the personal. Puškin's letters to his wife include numerous anecdotes, many of great biographical and social interest, such as the story of the forlorn rejected suitor's weeping while a wedding ceremony was being performed — the Puškins' own.³⁸ Several letters contain miniature dramatizations of events or conversations. In a few words he brings a whole scene to life. Once when Puškin returned from a journey, for example, "my wife was at a ball; I went to get her — and I took her away to my place, like a hussar taking off a provincial young lady from the name-day celebration of the town governor's wife."³⁹

A number of letters combine the familiar letter and the poetic epistle. Such poetic epistles were popular in Puškin's youth, and a number of his separate poems are in this genre. The verse epistles included in letters are full of wit and good humor, and they are as private as the letters themselves. They are in a free, light vein.

With all the stylistic variety of the letters, their most characteristic qualities remain frankness, simplicity, and sincerity. Love is presented, not in terms of subjective perception of the emotion, but the qualities of the beloved and his experience with her; aging is seen through the eyes of the peasant woman who tells him "in plain Russian" that he has "grown old and ugly."⁴⁰ Puškin's view of real family happiness is revealed in his unfulfilled prediction of the joy he and Pletnev will feel in seeing their sons "start playing rake" and their daughters, "at being sentimental."⁴¹ But Puškin never lays his whole heart bare. Though he revealed many and varied aspects of himself to different correspondents, behind the letters as behind the artistic works there can be sensed the whole personality, which allows only individual facets to be revealed. Puškin's

letters are masterful in all their varied types and styles, but they are most appealing when, with the sincerity and simplicity peculiar to himself, he for a moment reveals himself, to share a particular feeling or experience with a loved one.

Notes

1. In a somewhat different form, this paper was read at the Slavic Literatures section of the annual meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, in New York City in December 1958. The translations used are from the forthcoming two-volume first English edition of Puškin's Letters, translated, annotated, and with an Introduction by J. T. Shaw, to be published by Indiana University Press. The basic text used is that of Volume X of A. S. Puškin, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (10 vols., Akademija nauk, 1949); it has been collated with Volumes XIII-XVI of the textual edition, A. S. Puškin, Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (16 vols. in 20, Akademija nauk, 1937-49), and with other editions, especially Puškin, Pis'ma, Vols. I, II, edited by B. L. Modzalevskij (Moskva, Leningrad, 1926, 1929), and Vol. III, edited by L. B. Modzalevskij (1933); the fourth volume was never published. B. L. Modzalevskij's Introduction to the first volume of his edition of the Letters is the most thorough study of them which has appeared.

2. Puškin was angry when his uncle V. L. Puškin published his letter to him of December 28 (?), 1816; see his Diary, entry after April 9, 1821, and his letter to P. V. Vjazemskij of January 2, 1822; he wrote a letter of protest to the editor of the journal in which the unauthorized publication appeared (the letter has not survived). The journalist Bulgarin published without permission fragments from Puškin's letters to A. A. Bestužev of February 24, 1824, and June 29, 1824. For Puškin's reaction, see his letters to L. S. Puškin of April 1, 1824, and March 27, 1825. See also his letter to Natalija N. Puškina of May 18, 1834, regarding the privacy of correspondence.

3. Letter to M. L. Jakovlev of July 19, 1831.

4. Letter to Natalija N. Puškina of September 25, 1832.

5. Letter to N. N. Raevskij the Younger of January of June 30, 1829.

6. Letter of June 6, 1831, and especially the unsent letter of October 19, 1836.

7. Letter of November 4, 1830.

8. Letter to V. A. Žukovskij of April 1825; the reference is to a letter to Alexander I, of the same date.

9. Letter to P. A. Pletnev of March 7(?), 1826; the

reference is to the letter to V. A. Žukovskij, of the same date, which was written for the latter to show to Nicholas I.

10. Seven of Puškin's letters to Mme. Kern survive, plus one (of August 28, 1825) addressed to Mme. Osipova, but really intended for Mme. Kern.

11. The letters to Heeckeren include the unsent letter of November 17-21, 1836, and the letter of January 26, 1837, which led directly to Puškin's fatal duel with Heeckeren's adopted son, d'Anthès-Heeckeren.

12. Letter to A. A. Bestužev of the end of January 1825; there the reference is to Čatskij, hero of Griboedov's play, Woe from Wit (Gore ot uma).

13. Letter to A. A. Bestužev of November 30, 1825.

14. Letter to Praskovija A. Osipova of June 29, 1834.

15. Letter to P. A. Vjazemskij of July 13, 1825: "... anonyma (rod onanizma žurnal'nogo)."

16. Letter to M. N. Zagoskin of July 9, 1834: "očen' zamečatel'noe lico (ili daže lica)."

17. Letter to P. A. Pletnev, of March 3, 1826: "Čort voz'mi Onegina. Ja sam sebja xoču izdat' ili vydat' v svet."

18. Letter to P. A. Vjazemskij of May 1826: "Brak xolostit dušu."

19. Letter to Natalija N. Puškina of May 6, 1836: "... a ved' èto vse ravno čto zolotarstvo ... očiščat' russkuju literaturu est' čistit' nužniki i zaviset' ot policii."

20. Letter to A. A. Del'vig of November 4, 1830.

21. See especially Letters to the Arzamasians of September 1820 (?), and to P. A. Vjazemskij of August 31, 1831.

22. Letter to L. S. Puškin of December 20, 1834.

23. Letter to P. A. Vjazemskij of December 1-8, 1823.

24. Letter to L. S. Puškin of September 20, 1820.

25. Letter to P. A. Vjazemskij of September 13 and 15, 1825.

26. Letter to S. Z. Sobolevskij of July 15, 1827.

27. Letter to L. S. Puškin of January-February 1824.

28. In articles which Puškin published under the pseudonym of Feofilakt Kosičkin in 1831, "Toržestvo družby ili opravdannij Aleksandr Anfimovič Orlov," and "Neskol'ko slov o mizince g. Bulgarina i o pročem." The latter article includes a conspectus for a satirical novel on Bulgarin's life; Chapter V has as subject Ubi bene, ibi patria.

29. Letter to A. A. Del'vig of early June 1825. The allusion is to Puškin's "On Prose" (O proze), which he wrote in 1822 but did not publish.

30. Letter to Vera F. Vjazemskaja of the end of April 1830.

31. Letter to A. A. Orlov of November 24, 1831. Puškin's "defense" is the first article cited in Note 27 above.

32. Puškin speaks of Alexander I as "Octavian" (letter to N. I. Gnedič of March 24, 1821), as "Augustus" — with a pun on the month of August, which has the same form in Russian as Augustus (letters to L. S. Puškin of October 1822, and to P. A. Vjazemskij of February 6, 1823), and "Tiberius" (letter to P. A. Vjazemskij of June 24-25, 1824). There are also allusions to Alexander I under the terms "Ivan Ivanovich" (letter to L. S. Puškin of January-February 1824) and "the most white" (letter to V. Z. Žukovskij of the 20's of April 1825).

33. For example, in letters to Natalija N. Puškina of June 11, 1834, of June 28, 1834, of July 11, 1834, and of about July 14, 1834.

34. Letters to A. N. Vul'f, of the end of August and of October 10, 1825.

35. Letter to Elizaveta K. Voroncova of March 5, 1834. See M. P. Alekseev, "Novoe pis'mo Puškina," Izvestija Akademii nauk SSSR, Otdelenie literatury i jazyka, XV (1956), 250-254.

36. Letter to P. A. Vjazemskij of about November 7, 1825: "Žukovsky says that the Tsar will forgive me, as a result of my tragedy [Boris Godunov] — hardly, my dear one. Although it is written in a good spirit, there's no way I could hide my ears completely under the pointed cap of the holy fool. They stick out!"

37. For example, he disclaims authorship of his Gayriliada in his letter to P. V. Vjazemskij (of September 1, 1828), apparently hoping the police would intercept the letter and believe the story or that Vjazemskij would spread the same story; Puškin disclaimed political application of his "Upas Tree" (Ančar) in a letter to Count Benkendorf (of February 18-24, 1832), and of his "On the Convalescence of Lucullus" (Na vyzdorovlenie Lukulla) in a letter apparently to A. N. Mordvinov (of January-February 1836).

38. Letter to Natalija N. Puškina of September 25, 1832.

39. Letter to N. V. Naščokin of November 24, 1833.

40. Letter to Natalija N. Puškina of September 25, 1835.

41. Letter to N. P. Pletnev of July 22, 1831.

RUSSIAN LANGUAGE OFFERINGS IN U. S. SECONDARY SCHOOLS,
FEBRUARY 1960

By Ilo Remer

U. S. Office of Education

Two extensive surveys to compile data on foreign language instruction in the United States are now in progress. Under provisions of Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, a grant was made to the Modern Language Association of America for this purpose. Dr. Wesley Childers, Director of Research of the Foreign Language Program, is supervising the collection and processing of information received from State Departments of Education in response to questionnaires.

The other study in progress under the direction of Miss Esther Eaton, Specialist for Foreign Languages, U. S. Office of Education, samples public high schools of various sizes. Information will be supplied by teachers and principals. Co-ordination of the two projects has eliminated duplication of effort and overlapping. Some time will necessarily be required for processing, analysis, and publication of the data, once it is received. A more accurate estimate of secondary schools, public and independent, with Russian language instruction and total enrollments will be available when these studies are completed.

Card files have been kept in the Office of Education for over a year in an attempt to keep current information concerning Russian language offerings at various levels of instruction, including secondary. Names of schools, teachers, enrollments, instructional materials used, and other pertinent details are systematically recorded from such sources as published lists, correspondence, foreign language journals, State foreign language newsletters, newspapers and periodicals of a general nature, and oral reports. Mrs. Helen B. Yakobson has collaborated in this work from the beginning by making available on a continuing basis all pertinent information she receives in her capacity as Chairman of the AATSEEL Committee on Promotion of the Teaching of Russian and Other East European Languages in the Secondary School.

This compilation is offered not as a complete or authoritative list but for what it is — names of secondary schools which have been reported as offering opportunities for their students to study Russian, either in the regular curriculum, as an extra-school or club activity, or through participation in television courses (through the school) or in programs of other schools. Errors no doubt exist in spite of rigorous cross-checking and verification of school names and locations. We should appreciate having these called to our attention.

U.S. Secondary Schools Offering Russian Language Instruction to Their Students

Alabama

University Military School,
Mobile

Alaska

Anchorage High School, An-
chorage
Kodiak High School, Kodiak

Arizona

Arizona Language School,
Phoenix
Pueblo High School, Tucson
Rincon High School, Tucson

California

Alameda High School, Alameda
Arcadia First Avenue High
School, Arcadia
Citrus Union High School, Azusa
South High School, Bakersfield
Carlmont High School, Belmont
Berkeley High School, Berkeley
Campbell Union High School,
Campbell
Carmel High School, Carmel
Claremont Senior High School,
Claremont
Corona Senior High School,
Corona
Covina High School, Covina
Culver City Senior High School,
Culver City
Delano Union High School,
Delano
San Dieguito Union High School,
Encinitas
Fresno Senior High School,
Fresno
Grossmont Union High School,
Grossmont
Hawthorne High School, Haw-
thorne
Crystal Springs School for Girls,
Hillsborough
Redwood High School, Larkspur
Los Altos High School, Los Altos
Menlo School for Boys, Menlo
Park
Tamalpais Union High School,
Mill Valley
Mountain View High School,
Mountain View
Novato High School, Novato
Camarillo High School, Oxnard
Oxnard Union High School, Oxnard

California (cont.)

Cubberly High School, Palo Alto
Palo Alto Senior High School,
Palo Alto
John Muir High School, Pasadena
Pasadena Senior High School,
Pasadena
Piedmont Junior-Senior High
School, Piedmont
Central Valley High School,
Redding
Sequoia Union High School,
Redwood City
Woodside High School, Redwood
City
Ramona High School, Riverside
Polytechnic High School, River-
side
Chadwick School, Rollins Hills
C. K. McClatchy Senior High
School, Sacramento
North Salinas High School,
Salinas
Clairemont High School, San
Diego
Hoover High School, San Diego
Mission Bay High School, San
Diego
Point Loma Senior High School,
San Diego
San Diego Senior High School,
San Diego
Lincoln High School, San Fran-
cisco
Sonoma Valley Union High
School, Sonoma
Fremont High School, Sunnyvale
Torrance High School, Torrance
Birmingham High School, Van
Nuys
California High School, Whittier
El Rancho High School, Whittier
Whittier High School, Whittier
Woodland High School, Woodland
Woodside High School, Woodside

Colorado

Arvada High School, Arvada
Baseline Junior High School,
Boulder
Boulder High School, Boulder
Casey Junior High School,
Boulder
Fountain Valley School, Colorado
Springs

Colorado (cont.)

Alameda High School, Denver
 East High School, Denver
 Jefferson High School, Denver
 Evergreen High School, Evergreen
 Golden High School, Golden
 Lakewood High School, Lakewood
 Bear Creek Constitutional High School, Morrison
 Wheatridge High School, Wheatridge

Connecticut

Andrew Ward High School, Fairfield
 Roger Ludlowe High School, Fairfield
 Glastonbury High School, Glastonbury
 Greenwich High School, Greenwich
 Hamden Hall Country Day School, Hamden
 Hotchkiss School, Lakeville
 Westover School, Middlebury
 Milford High School, Milford
 New Britain Senior High School, New Britain
 New Canaan High School, New Canaan
 Hillhouse High School, New Haven
 Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven
 Norwich Free Academy, Norwich
 Westminster School, Simsbury
 Southbury High School, Southbury
 Stamford High School, Stamford
 Choate School, Wallingford
 Waterford High School, Waterford
 Woodstock Academy, Woodstock

Delaware

Newark High School, Newark

District of Columbia

Archbishop Carroll High School, Washington
 Eastern High School, Washington
 Sacred Heart School, Washington
 St. Albans School, Washington
 Western High School, Washington
 Woodrow Willson High School, Washington

Florida

Fort Lauderdale High School, Fort Lauderdale

Florida (cont.)

Howey Academy, Howey-in-the-Hills
 Melbourne High School, Melbourne
 Miami Jackson High School, Miami
 North Miami Senior High School, North Miami
 Graham Eckes School, Palm Beach

Illinois

Canton Senior High School, Canton
 Hyde Park High School, Chicago
 Maine Township High School, Des Plaines
 Lyons Township High School, La Grange
 Lake Forest Academy, Lake Forest
 Proviso High School, Maywood
 Niles Township High School, Skokie
 River Forest High School, Oak Park
 New Trier Township High School, Winnetka

Indiana

Culver Military Academy, Culver
 North Central High School, Indianapolis
 Speedway High School, Speedway

Louisiana

Benjamin Franklin High School, New Orleans

Maryland

Edmondson Senior High School, Baltimore
 Friends School of Baltimore, Baltimore
 Our Lady of Lourdes High School, Bethesda
 Regina High School, Hyattsville
 Loyola High School, Towson

Massachusetts

Phillips Academy, Andover
 The Browne and Nichols School, Cambridge
 Shady Hill School, Cambridge
 Concord Senior High School, Concord
 Eaglebrook School, Deerfield
 B. M. C. Durfee High School, Fall River
 Groton School, Groton

Massachusetts (cont.)

Hopkinton High School, Hopkinton
 Tabor Academy, Marion
 Needham Senior High School, Needham
 Newton Senior High School, Newton
 Brooks School, North Andover
 North Andover High School, North Andover
 Weston High School, Weston

Michigan

Ann Arbor High School, Ann Arbor
 Cass High School, Detroit
 Central High School, Detroit
 Cody High School, Detroit
 Denby High School, Detroit
 Ford High School, Detroit
 Mackenzie High School, Detroit
 Mumford High School, Detroit
 Osborn High School, Detroit
 Pershing High School, Detroit
 Redford High School, Detroit
 Southeastern High School, Detroit
 Grosse Pointe University School, Grosse Pointe Woods
 Central High School, Kalamazoo
 Charles Brake Junior High School, Taylor
 Taylor Junior High School, Taylor
 Tecumseh High School, Tecumseh

Montana

Helena High School, Helena

Nebraska

Brownell Hall, Omaha
 Central High School, Omaha

New Hampshire

St. Paul's School, Concord
 Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter
 Meeting School, Rindge

New Jersey

Atlantic City Friends School, Atlantic City
 Arthur L. Johnson Regional High School, Clark
 Cranford High School, Cranford
 Pingry School, Elizabeth
 Englewood School for Boys, Englewood
 Fair Lawn Senior High School, Fair Lawn

New Jersey (cont.)

Freehold High School, Freehold
 Hackensack High School, Hackensack
 Pascack Valley Regional High School, Hillsdale
 St. Peter's Preparatory School, Jersey City
 Kearney High School, Kearney
 St. Alexander Newsky Church School, Lakewood
 Montclair Academy, Montclair
 Morristown High School, Morristown
 Passaic High School, Passaic
 Pennsville Memorial High School, Pennsville
 Miss Fine's School, Princeton
 Roselle Park High School, Roselle Park
 Sparta High School, Sparta
 Teaneck High School, Teaneck
 Tenafly High School, Tenafly

New Mexico

Albuquerque Senior High School, Albuquerque
 Highland High School, Albuquerque
 Sandia High School, Albuquerque
 Valley High School, Albuquerque
 Aztec High School, Aztec
 Espanola High School, Espanola
 Farmington High School, Farmington
 Los Alamos High School, Los Alamos
 Roswell High School, Roswell
 Santa Fe High School, Santa Fe

New York

St. Francis High School, Anthol Springs
 Baldwin High School, Baldwin
 Bayport High School, Bayport
 Bay Shore High School, Bay Shore
 Benjamin Junior High School, Brooklyn
 Berriman Junior High School, Brooklyn
 Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn
 Midwood High School, Brooklyn
 St. Joseph Commercial High School, Brooklyn
 Bennett High School, Buffalo
 Sweet Home Central School, Buffalo
 Chadwicks High School, Chadwicks

New York (cont.)

New York Military Academy,
Cornwall-on-Hudson
Bethlehem Central High School,
Delmar
Jamesville-De Witt High
School, De Witt
Elmont Memorial High School,
Elmont
Floral Park Memorial High
School, Floral Park
Garden City High School, Gar-
den City
Huntington High School, Hunt-
ington
Walt Whitman High School,
Huntington Station
Division Avenue High School,
Levittown
Lockport Senior High School,
Lockport
Long Beach High School, Long
Beach
Mamaroneck High School,
Mamaroneck
Manhasset Junior-Senior High
School, Manhasset
Marcellus High School, Marcel-
lus
Massapequa High School, Mas-
sapequa
Merrick Avenue Junior High
School, Merrick
Merrick Avenue Senior High
School, Merrick
Middletown Senior High School,
Middletown
New Hartford High School, New
Hartford
Bronx High School of Science,
New York
Columbia Grammar School,
New York
Fordham College High School,
New York
Horace Mann School, New York
Our Savior Lutheran School,
New York
Rhodes School, New York
Riverdale Country Day School,
New York
Russian Eastern Orthodox Ca-
thedral School, New York
Seward Park High School, New
York
Stuyvesant High School, New
York
New York Mills High School,
New York Mills

New York (cont.)

Shaker High School, Newtonville
DeVeaux School, Niagara Falls
Oriskany High School, Oriskany
Harley School, Rochester
Rye High School, Rye
Knox School, St. James
Linton High School, Schenectady
Mt. Pleasant High School,
Schenectady
Park School of Buffalo, Snyder
Blodgett Vocational High School,
Syracuse
Central Technical High School,
Syracuse
H. W. Smith Technical and In-
dustrial High School, Syracuse
Onondaga Valley Academy,
Syracuse
William Nottingham High School,
Syracuse
Catholic Central High School,
Troy
Uniondale High School, Uniondale
Central High School, Valley
Stream
Memorial High School, Valley
Stream
Vestal Central School, Vestal
West Islip High School, West
Islip
Whitesboro Central School,
Whitesboro
Halsted School, Yonkers

North Carolina

Asheville Country Day School,
Asheville

North Dakota

Fargo Senior High School, Fargo
South Junior High School, Grand
Forks

Ohio

Benedictine High School, Cleve-
land
West Technical High School,
Cleveland
Ohio State Union High School,
Columbus
University High School, Colum-
bus
Fairmont High School, Fairmont
Hamilton Senior High School,
Hamilton
Western Reserve Academy,
Hudson
Kent State University High
School, Kent

Ohio (cont.)

Kettering High School, Kettering
Mad River Township High
School, Mad River
Newark High School, Newark
Parma Senior High School,
Parma
Shaker Heights High School,
Shaker Heights
Caraway High School, Sugar-
creek

Oregon

Sunset High School, Beaverton
The Dalles High School, The
Dalles
Cleveland High School, Portland
Franklin High School, Portland
Grant High School, Portland
Jefferson High School, Portland
Madison High School, Portland
Roosevelt High School, Portland
Washington High School, Port-
land
Woodrow Wilson High School,
Portland
Reedsport High School, Reeds-
port
Springfield Junior High School,
Springfield
Troutdale High School, Trout-
dale

Pennsylvania

Abington Senior High School,
Abington
Aliquippa High School, Aliquippa
Allentown High School, Allen-
town
Dieruff High School, Allentown
Hampton Township High School,
Alison Park
Ambridge High School, Am-
bridge
Saint Veronica High School,
Ambridge
Lower Merion Senior High
School, Ardmore
Berwick Area Senior High
School, Berwick
Bethlehem High School, Beth-
lehem
Boyertown Area Junior and
Senior High School, Boyertown
George School, Bucks County
St. Luke High School, Carnegie
Clairton Senior High School,
Clairton
Coaldale High School, Coaldale

Pennsylvania (cont.)

Our Lady of the Sacred Heart,
Coraopolis
Duquesne Senior High School,
Duquesne
Westmont Hilltop High School,
Johnstown
William Tennent Junior-Senior
High School, Johnsville
Saint Xavier Academy, Latrobe
Penncrest High School, Lima
Warwick High School, Lititz
Saint Francis De Sales, McKees
Rocks
Stephen C. Foster School,
McKees Rocks
Upper Valley High School,
Mayfield
Mercersburg Academy, Mer-
cersburg
Penn Manor Joint High School,
Millersville
Gateway Senior High School,
Monroeville
Franklin Area Joint High School,
Murrysville
Saint Joseph High School, Natrona
Har-Brack Senior High School,
Natrona Heights
Solebury School, New Hope
Wilmington Area High School,
New Wilmington
Carson Long Institute, North
Bloomfield
Central High School, Philadel-
phia
Friends' Central School, Phila-
delphia
Annunciation High School, Pitts-
burgh
Divine Providence High School,
Pittsburgh
Holy Innocents High School,
Pittsburgh
Mt. Alvernia High School, Pitts-
burgh
Our Lady of Mercy Academy,
Pittsburgh
Sacred Heart High School,
Pittsburgh
St. Adalbert High School, Pitts-
burgh
St. Augustine's High School,
Pittsburgh
St. Basils High School, Pitts-
burgh
St. Casimir High School, Pitts-
burgh

Pennsylvania (cont.)

St. James High School, Pittsburgh
 St. Joseph's High School, Pittsburgh
 St. Justin High School, Pittsburgh
 St. Wendelin High School, Pittsburgh
 Vincentian High School, Pittsburgh
 Watson Home for Crippled Children, Pittsburgh
 Hill School, Pottstown
 Reading Senior High School, Reading
 Scranton Central High School, Scranton
 St. Mary's High School, Sharpsburg
 Springfield Junior-Senior High School, Springfield
 St. Anselm's High School, Swissvale
 Trafford High School, Trafford
 Lafayette Junior High School, Uniontown
 Mount St. Macrina Academy, Uniontown
 Uniontown Joint High School, Uniontown
 Warren Area Joint High School, Warren
 William Penn Senior High School, York

Rhode Island

Cranston High School, Cranston
 St. George's School, Newport

South Dakota

Huron Junior High School, Huron
 Huron Senior High School, Huron

Tennessee

Chattanooga High School, Chattanooga
 Central Tennessee State College
 Campus School, Murfreesboro

Texas

William Adams High School, Alice
 Bellaire High School, Bellaire
 Sunset High School, Dallas
 Denton Preparatory School, Denton

Utah

Davis County Central High School, Kaysville

Utah (cont.)

Weber High School, Ogden
 St. Mark's School, Salt Lake City
 Jordan High School, Sandy

Vermont

Craftsbury Common High School, (Summer School), Craftsbury Common
 The Putney School, Putney

Virginia

Episcopal High School, Alexandria
 Annandale High School, Annandale
 Chatham Hall, Chatham
 Fairfax High School, Fairfax
 Falls Church High School, Falls Church
 Armstrong High School, Richmond
 John Marshall High School, Richmond
 Maggie L. Walder High School, Richmond
 Thomas Jefferson High School, Richmond
 Roanoke Jefferson Senior High School, Roanoke

Washington

Bellevue High School, Bellevue
 Brewster High School, Brewster
 Washington Junior High School, Olympia
 Renton Junior-Senior High School, Renton
 Chief Joseph Junior High School, Richland
 Columbia High School, Richland
 Ballard High School, Seattle
 Butler Junior High School, Seattle
 Cordell Hull Junior High School, Seattle
 Denny Junior High School, Seattle
 Edison High School, Seattle
 Garfield High School, Seattle
 Highline High School, Seattle
 Meany Junior High School, Seattle
 Roosevelt High School, Seattle
 Sealath High School, Seattle
 Shoreline High School, Seattle
 Stadium High School, Tacoma

Wisconsin

Wayland Academy, Beaver Dam
 Wisconsin High School, Madison

Wisconsin (cont.)

Nicolet High School, Milwaukee
Rufus King High School, Milwaukee

Wisconsin (cont.)

St. Catherine's High School,
Racine

U.S. Secondary Schools Offering Russian Language Instruction
in Other Programs¹

California

Acalenes Union High School,
Lafayette
Jordan Senior High School, Long
Beach
Palo Alto Senior High School,
Palo Alto
Marina Evening High School,
San Francisco
San Jose Unified School District,
San Jose
Tornales Union High School,
Tornales
Watsonville High School, Wat-
sonville

Connecticut

Bassick School, Bridgeport
Naugatuck High School, Nauga-
tuck
Torrington High School, Tor-
rington
Crosby High School, Waterbury
Taft School, Watertown
Staples High School, Westport

Florida

Mary Karl Vocational High
School, Daytona Beach
Fort Lauderdale High School,
Fort Lauderdale
Leesburg High School, Leesburg
Miami Edison Senior High
School, Miami
North Miami Senior High School,
Miami
Seminole High School, Sanford
Sarasota High School, Sarasota
Tavares High School, Tavares

Illinois

River Forest High School, Oak
Park
Rich Township High School,
Park Forest
Springfield Public Schools,
Springfield

Indiana

Thomas Mann High School, Gary
Shortridge High School, Indi-
anapolis

Iowa

Dubuque Senior High School,
Dubuque

Maryland

Kensington Junior High School,
Kensington

Massachusetts

Belmont Public Schools, Belmont
Framingham Public Schools,
Framingham

Michigan

Midland Public Schools, Midland

New York

North Colonie Central School,
Albany County
Glen Head Public Schools, Glen
Head
Guilderland Central High School,
Guilderland Center
DeWitt Clinton High School, New
York

Ohio

Bellefontaine City Schools,
Bellefontaine
Cleveland Heights Public Schools,
Cleveland Heights
Youngstown Public Schools,
Youngstown

Pennsylvania

Chambersburg High School,
Chambersburg
Easton High School, Easton
Germantown High School,
Philadelphia

Texas

Goose Creek Public Schools,
Baytown

Washington

Olympia High School, Olympia

Note

1. In some cases the programs are adult education; in others their nature has not yet been identified.

REVIEWS

Andrey Biely. St. Petersburg. Tr. John Cournos. New York: Grove Press [c. 1959]. xxii, 310, \$4.75.

The reading public of the English speaking world may congratulate itself upon a discovery — one of the outstanding works of twentieth century literature, Andrej Belyj's novel, St. Petersburg, now brought out in an able translation by John Cournos, from the revised Russian edition of 1922.

In a short review one cannot dwell upon the creative history of a given work. Lack of space will therefore preclude going into the details of the publication of Belyj's novel. All one can do is to refer the interested reader to Belyj's published version of the story. (See Načalo veka, pp. 326-327, 447, 471-472; also Literaturnoe Nasledstvo, XXVII-XXVIII (1939), 452-456.)

St. Petersburg, written in 1911, was originally conceived as the second part of a proposed trilogy "East and West" and thus a sequel to the novel, The Silver Dove (1908-9). In the best symbolist tradition, the novel is developed along two planes, the physical and the metaphysical. The basic plot deals with the conflict between the spirit of the West and that of the Orient, with Russia during the years of the revolution of 1905-7 as the battleground. Physically it concerns itself with the fate of Nikolaj Apollonovič Ableuxov, the only son of the venerable bureaucrat Senator Apollon Apollonovič Ableuxov. The young Ableuxov is a student of philosophical bent, who had once had the imprudence to express an interest in the terrorist movement, and suddenly discovers himself confronted with orders to commit parricide by planting a time bomb in his father's room.

The metaphysical plane of the narrative makes recourse to the setting — the city of St. Petersburg (which becomes the actual "hero" of the novel) — in order to bring out the symbolic significance of the work. Belyj's description of St. Petersburg as the city of shadows that somehow blend evilly with the misty, windy night, reminds one unmistakably of Puškin's, Dostoevskij's, and, above all, Gogol's depiction of that city.

Belyj in the treatment of his theme, however, goes beyond his predecessors. He carries the Gogolian negation ("Nevskij Prospekt") of the reality of Petersburg to its logical conclusion.

Externally, the city with its harmonious geometrical designs appears to be the very epitome of reality — the result of planned Western reasoning; it is the very acme of rational order with its rectilinear mesh of streets; its "squares, parallelepipeds, and cubes" mark it as the very quintessence of planned harmony. And yet beneath its veneer of order, moves

the spirit of Oriental Chaos — unstable, menacing, and disruptive. It is the spirit of annihilation. This is the real soul of Belyj's St. Petersburg. Time and again Belyj shows the illusoriness of his well-ordered reality. The unreality of the essence of his St. Petersburg is seen symbolized by the shadows which, depending on the position of the source of light, continue to wax and wane as they pursue the young Ableuxov on his nocturnal journey through the city's streets. The city, and with it all life, is seen peopled actually not by humans but by shadows, ever fluctuating and ever unreal.

The same dualistic attitude toward reality that is seen in Belyj's dealing with the physical setting extends to his depiction of his characters. Some, such as Sofija Lixutin or Senator Ableuxov, impress the reader with their realistic (albeit caricatured) essence. Yet when contrasted with the phantom-like figure of Šišnarfne even they — Sofija with her highpitched giggle and her typically feminine coquetry, and the Senator with his Kareninesque green ears, seem also to dissolve into the Neva mist.

Stylistically the novel features many of the characteristics which Belyj introduced in his earlier works, especially the *Symphonies*. These include the rhythmical phraseology, which frequently approaches regular meter (chiefly the amphibrach), the impressionistic mosaic of narrative pattern, with its constant shift of planes between the material and the spiritual. The geometrical designs of physical objects moreover continue in the vein of his *African Travel Sketches* (1910).

The outstanding characteristic that marks Belyj's novel, however, is the constant interplay between reality and illusion, which is skilfully maintained to the very end of the narrative. Finally, upon concluding the story the reader realizes that what Belyj gave in the Prologue to the novel as material proof to the assertion that St. Petersburg does, and must, exist — there it is located as a point on the map of the Russian Empire — is nothing more than a mathematical statement of a problem. And in developing his arguments Belyj succeeds precisely in proving his hypothesis and thereby dissolves his world, with St. Petersburg as its center, into nothingness by reducing its essence to — a point on the map, i. e., a geometrical "locus of no dimension."

(Oleg A. Maslenikov
University of California (Berkeley))

Vsevolod Setschkareff. N. S. Leskov: Sein Leben und sein Werk. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. 170 pp.

Leskov's works were long neglected by Russian radical critics. Nevertheless many generations of Russian readers liked to read his novels and short stories, which were available in a cheap edition published in the pre-Revolutionary magazine *Niva*.

We have excellent studies on Leskov's style by the Formalist Boris Ejxenbaum. More recently, non-Russian Slavists

have also written good essays on Leskov (among them are two Americans, W. B. Edgerton and H. McLean). No one, however, had made an attempt to write an exhaustive study covering both Leskov's life and creative work before V. Setschkareff (Harvard) wrote the book under review. It makes interesting reading for the general reader as well as for the scholar. Setschkareff has done justice to this great Russian stylist and, at the same time, has defined the limitations of Leskov's fascinating talent. He has emphasized two main tendencies which determine the literary work of this brilliant and controversial writer: (1) his belief in the "ethical-good" ("das Ethisch-Gute") as a basis of all judgments of people, and (2) his purely esthetic experiments with language as such. As often happens, these two tendencies — the ethical and the esthetic — do not always coincide, and lead to contradictions in the artistic works.

Leskov introduced so-called skaz — an expressive idiom spoken by semi-educated or even ignorant characters, such as the wandering peasant (The Enchanted Pilgrim) or an Old Believer (The Sealed Angel). Both these characters arouse our sympathy. But skaz was also used by some of his villains, such as Domna (The Amazon), and the reader may have the impression that for the author his own mastery of style was more important than the moral, in which he only pretended to believe. One may even say that for Leskov words meant more than the human beings presented in their skaz. Thus Setschkareff is right in affirming that Leskov's characters lack vividness ("Menschen entstehen nicht unter Leskovs Feder," p. 74). Setschkareff has coined a very good term for his general characterization of Leskov as a writer: Mosaikarbeiter. Leskov's writings are indeed inlaid works, mosaics made of little pieces, i. e., of some witty words or phrases, bon mots, puns, or striking remarks, anecdotes; and this mosaic-like art, as Setschkareff notes, works well for short stories but not long novels dealing with the psychological development of characters. Setschkareff also discusses other formal devices, and he devotes considerable discussion to the philosophical problems reflected in Leskov's works: the treatment of historical subjects à la Flaubert, the influence of Dostoevskij's Possessed, sympathies with the Quakers, interpretations of Schopenhauer's and Tolstoj's ideas, and many other topics which may occasion more detailed studies by Leskov admirers. Setschkareff's book on Leskov is good for orientation as well as for inspiration.

In addition, I should like to suggest a theme which does not fit into the framework of Setschkareff's study, dedicated as it is only to Leskov's life and works. There is no doubt that his influence was important during the so-called Silver Age of Russian literature (1894-1917), when his writings were revaluated by the Symbolists and influenced the works of another writer of mosaics, Aleksej Remizov (1877-1957). The latter, in turn, transmitted his own interpretation of Leskov to such Soviet writers as Evgenij Zamjatin, Boris Pilnjak, and Leonid Leonov. We can even trace Leskov's influence on V. Xlebnikov (1886-1922). His bold experiments with language, both in prose and poetry, and his attempts to treat words as things — creating new meanings and even a new sensibility — may also be connected with Leskov, who coined such strange expressions

as nesmertel'nyj golovan, which sound like "trans-sense" (zaumnye) words used by Xlebnikov. Leskov's shadow is seen behind all Russian experimentalists, including Remizov and some of the Serapion Brothers and Futurists.

George Ivask
University of Kansas

Avrahm Yarmolinsky. Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age. New York: The Orion Press [c. 1959]. xiv, 406, \$6.00.

The first edition of this work was for many years the best introduction in English to Turgenev's life and its position was not seriously challenged by D. Magarshack's more recent (1954) but less substantial work. Over the years Mr. Yarmolinsky seems to have taken a more mellow and compassionate view of his subject. The resultant attenuated portrait is that of a kindly, gentle, weak genius; it minimizes the capricious, hysterical, and fractious personality that Turgenev occasionally displayed. Apart from this change, the present version differs from its predecessor only in the more extensive mention of Henry James, some reliance (not very extensive) on material that has come to light since 1926, a stylistic revision, and several minor corrections.

The volume contains a chronological table of Turgenev's life and a brief "bibliographical note" on selected items in the important Turgenev material published between 1930 and 1955, but it has almost no notes and no bibliography. This is a serious, and unfortunate, omission. While much of the material necessarily comes from well known and readily accessible works, much too depends upon Mr. Yarmolinsky's knowledge of the subject and sources sufficiently recondite so that documentation would provide a useful service. Despite this shortcoming, Mr. Yarmolinsky's work can be depended upon. There are only a few minor discrepancies: Turgenev's manuscripts make it absolutely clear that First Love is autobiographical (p. 12); more additional information on Turgenev's planned but unwritten novel (pp. 333-334) is available elsewhere, particularly in A. E. Gruzinskij's work on Turgenev (Moscow, 1918, pp. 198-199); Zajcev's (not Zavtzev's) book was published in 1949, not 1932 (p. 395); the transliteration does not distinguish "ju" from "u" so that there are numerous references to "Stasulevich."

While the volume is entitled Turgenev: The Man, His Art and His Age, it deals but prefunctorily with the latter two. There is no attempt to analyze the works, nor even any significant attempt, except in the most general terms, to give the main traits of Turgenev's craft and his distinction as a writer of fiction. His poetic, dramatic, and critical works receive even less mention. The Age, too, is dealt with cursorily. Mr. Yarmolinsky leaves many things unsaid that could as easily be stated. To give but one example, the stimulating propagator of Schelling in Moscow University (p. 22) is never identified as Pavlov, though he occupies five lines. More specific information would dispel the impression of vagueness that frequently

asserts itself. Turgenev's relations with other writers both in Russia and abroad are not only fascinating in their own right, but are vital to an understanding of Turgenev's art and the progress of letters in Russia and abroad. This aspect is rather slighted, and there is thus some confusion about the relevance of the background to the biography. In any case it would be useful only if it were sufficiently reflected in the life or the work, and this is not always done.

The gravest shortcoming of the book, however, is that Mr. Yarmolinsky has not sufficiently dramatized his subject. Perhaps the leading character, as Mr. Yarmolinsky conceives him, was too weak not to escape definition. Yet such impressive personalities as Turgenev's mother and Pauline Viardot also do not distinguish themselves sufficiently. In part this must be attributed to the asking of rhetorical questions instead of characterizing: apropos of the opening of *Spring Freshets* we read "does not this image convey the essence of Turgenev's private laments?" (304); when Turgenev declines an invitation to meet Renan, we read "Was it that he felt an instinctive dislike for the man who was to pronounce the funeral oration over his body . . . ?" (296).

The book, more than its first version, must be termed a chronological commentary on Turgenev's life. As such it is very useful insofar as it adduces important excerpts from Turgenev's correspondence, his works, and memoirs about him to present a thorough and cogent view.

Ralph E. Matlaw
Princeton University

Natalie Duddington and Nadejda Gorodetzky. *Lev Tolstoy Selections*. (Oxford Russian Readers.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1959. xv, 207, \$3.75.

This third volume in the series of Oxford Russian Readers is intended as a reader to introduce the "fairly elementary and more advanced" Russian language student to Tolstoj. Hence, there is a judicious selection of extracts from Tolstoj's novels, short stories, and letters preceded by a biography of the author in English. While such an introduction is helpful to an understanding of Tolstoj and his philosophy, it might have been more valuable had it been in Russian also. Russian biography, read and retold, at times can be quite beneficial to the learner. After all, there are copious lives in English already.

The reading material itself is presented chronologically and thus should serve to bring out the development of Tolstoj's ideas on a variety of subjects if this can be done adequately in such short selections. The advantage of brief excerpted selections lies in the fact that they can be covered in a class session without much difficulty. Therefore, this book should arouse the interest of the young student in reading more of the author's works in the original.

However, if these selections are presented as a Russian

language manual for "more advanced" students it may well defeat its purpose. First of all, a good student will not find here either an adequate challenge or sufficient diversity of style. Lev Tolstoj's style is less difficult than that of other Russian writers. It cannot be compared with the stylistic complexities of Gogol', Dostoevskij and others. Hence, an advanced reader would do well to include a selection of authors to illustrate many different styles.

Another point is accentuation. In the Selections the Russian text is accented throughout. This is necessary for the beginner, but in my judgment he must be weaned away from this prop so that he will become accustomed to unaccented texts — to "real Russian" as he calls it. Therefore the advantage of this entirely accented text for the advanced student is debatable.

The reading material makes up only 102 of the total of 207 pages. The remaining 105 pages include notes, selected idioms and difficult constructions, and vocabulary. The notes, translations of idiomatic constructions with illustrative parallels, colloquialisms and proverbs are useful but many are quite simple and have become known to students in early stages of Russian language learning. The editors have attempted to ease the learning process by the inclusion of a well-arranged vocabulary and accent pattern summary. This summary together with the comments on the arrangement does manage to give more than first glance would indicate. However, the necessary practise in limited vocabularies of this nature, i. e., one English meaning to a word, tends to leave the student with the impression of a one-to-one equivalency in meaning. At this stage in the study of the language, the use of a good dictionary might consume more time, but it would add to the student's "feel" for the language. Had these 75 pages been devoted to text, Lev Tolstoy Selections would be an even more welcome addition to the distinguished manuals for Russian language study now being prepared for our schools.

However, the over-all presentation is excellent and as an introduction to Russian literature as represented by Lev Tolstoj, the Selections will serve an eminently useful purpose.

Walter C. Jaskiewicz
Fordham University

Ronald Hingley, ed. Soviet Prose: A Reader. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp. [c. 1959]. 238 pp., \$3.50.

Mr. Hingley's Reader fills a real need in materials for Russian language instruction as well as for the study of Soviet literature. Contemporary fiction presents to the learner of Russian difficulties that are almost insurmountable without special and detailed assistance. The present reviewer at an early stage moved from Tolstoj's lucid nineteenth-century prose directly into the linguistic mazes of The Quiet Don, and might very well have been discouraged at the difficulties encountered but for the daily oral annotation of a teacher conversant with Šoloxov's language and style. Teachers of Russian still hesitate

to assign readings in Soviet authors except in the most advanced courses, because of what Hingley calls "the linguistic iron curtain" which confronts the learner at that point. It is in the hope of breaching this "iron curtain" that Mr. Hingley compiled his reading selections.

Selections include excerpts from A. N. Tolstoj's Road to Calvary, Šoloxov's Quiet Don and Virgin Soil Upturned, Leonov's Badgers, Pilnjak's Mahogany, Romanov's Comrade Kisljakov, Kataev's Time Forward, Nikolaeva's Battle on the Way, Dudincev's Not By Bread Alone, and shorter pieces of A. N. Tolstoj, Zoščenko, Bulgakov, and Il'f and Petrov. All periods of Soviet literature are represented, though special favor is shown to the twenties, no doubt the most interesting period in the history of Soviet prose. The selections are weighted with grim scenes of revolution and civil war, though humour, satire, and science fiction are also represented. The literature of official optimism is not included in the anthology — a wise decision.

The notes provided are extensive and illuminating. Mr. Hingley understands where the English-speaking student is likely to find modern Russian difficult, and he provides intelligent annotation in places where it is really needed. While the notes are intended to throw light on linguistic problems, they also provide much information on Russian history and culture. The Reader is equipped with a vocabulary containing a selection of the most difficult words used in the text, together with information on accentuation and inflection. The notes and the vocabulary are the product of good judgment and linguistic competence. This book can be highly recommended for advanced courses in the Russian language, where intelligently annotated texts have long been a major need.

Edward J. Brown
Brown University

F. M. Borrás and R. F. Christian. Russian Syntax: Aspects of Modern Russian Syntax and Vocabulary. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. xi, 404, \$5.60.

The title of this book is somewhat misleading. Actually only about one-third of the book contains material usually considered under the heading of syntax. Much material that is usually presented in works on syntax has been omitted. The authors are well aware of this, as they admit in the first paragraph of the Preface, and they have tried to remedy the situation with an accurate subtitle, but it would have seemed better to have dropped the more comprehensive formulation altogether.

On the other hand they have succeeded admirably in their stated goal of helping "students with a good knowledge of Russian grammar to overcome some of the difficulties of writing consecutive Russian prose . . . [and to] bring out some of the essential characteristics of the Russian language as an instrument of expression." As a reference grammar or text to be used with an advanced class or by an individual already possessing a knowledge of the basic fundamentals of the language and

desiring mastery of the more important details, this book is the best book in English with which this reviewer is acquainted. The Russian usage and examples are uniformly good Russian, which is in itself unusual in a book of this scope. Occasionally the explanations are misleading and the student could easily mistake the authors' meaning; in a very few cases the author, while giving the correct Russian forms, misinterpret the reasons for their use (see below).

In general, though, there are surprisingly few errors for the first edition of a book which obviously represents much original research. The weakest points are in the treatment of co-ordination and hypotaxis (both practically lacking), and in parts of the treatment of verbs (but most of the work here is excellent).

The strongest point is in the presentation of translation equivalents. Most of these are extremely useful and important expressions, not usually known, at least in detail, by intermediate students.

In spite of a list of Russian words used in the text (far from complete) and a four-page English index, the book does not appear useful as a reference book. It seems most valuable when read through from cover to cover. This book should be required reading for the new intermediate student, and even those with several years of reading Russian behind them will probably find it to be well worth their while to read through it.

The Russian material is so interwoven in the presentation with English vocabulary and grammar that the foreigner who reads English without having mastered all the nuances, runs a serious risk of misunderstanding at several points. It is recommended only for native and near-native speakers of English.

Below are only a few of the points noticed in going through the text, since space does not permit a comprehensive listing:

Page 5 § 12. The statement about reluctance to consider animals as animate beings should refer to students, since it is certainly not true of native Russians. As presented, it encourages students to consider animals and insects as inanimate.

Page 6 top. The wonder at the inclusion of pokójnik and mertvéc in the "animate" class as well as at the exclusion of plants, seems to imply misconception of the underlying basis for this distinction in Russian.

Page 10. Probably 'lengthiness' would be a better translation of dlinnotá.

Page 11. While the instrumental may be used as stated in clauses "with no verbal link," it cannot be used after the # present tense of byt'. The examples cited belong to other uses of the instrumental case and do not belong in this section.

Page 12 § 22 (ii). This is the same use of the instrumental case as on page 11 § 21 (i) (b): "The instrumental indicating function," which the authors apparently do not recognize and confuse elsewhere with the "instrumental of comparison." At any rate the sentence eščé mál'cikom ja ljúbíl múzyku does not belong with "predicate instrumentals after the verb byt'" solely because mál'čikom could be replaced by the clause kogdá ja byl mál'čikom.

Page 18 (c). It should be stated that the partitive genitive can be used only with perfective verbs and a very, very limited

list of imperfectives (xotet'), which should be listed. The listing of pokupat' and dostavát' here is misleading.

Page 21 § 32 (ii) (d). Xotet' and želat' are lumped together, the genitive being allowed for abstract nouns and the accusative preferred in concrete situations. This is a reasonable statement for xotet', the real distinction being definite ~ indefinite (like English a ~ the), but želat' allows the accusative only in the sense of 'desire sexually.' Otherwise it governs only the genitive.

Page 25 § 35. Again the usage is only after the perfective of the verbs cited.

Page 46 § 56. The list of words with locatives in -ú is very short, omitting many very common nouns which require this ending. More important, though, is the lack of mention of third-declension feminines with a locative₂ in -í (v grjazí, v dalí, v kroví, v nočí, v pylí, v svjazí, v stepí, v tení, na cepí, and more than twenty others in common use, where the locative₁ case has unaccented -i).

The statement that the locative ending -ú may be used only after y and na "except polkú which may be used after any preposition" is incorrect. O polkú is simply not possible in Russian and one strongly suspects confusion with the title of a literary work written in a different language — Old Russian.

Page 92. The statement about the difference between soveršennyj and soveršennij "now being rather a difference of spelling than of stress" shows a misconception of the history of this word.

Page 147. When the authors state that "English often uses the same verbs to express both a transitive and an intransitive action, Russian never," they seem to have forgotten such verbs as videt', slyšat', ponimat' and several others. Here the concept of "transitivity" is confused with the medio-passive concept, which does not exist in English, but does in almost all other European languages, including Russian. Medio-passive verbs may never be transitive, whereas active verbs may be "only intransitive," "only transitive," or both. Medio-passive verbs should of course not be confused with the passive voice of active verbs (formed most commonly from perfective verbs).

Page 242 § 418. The section on the conjunctions a, i, and že. "A in Russian is often merely an alternative for i (and) or no (but)" shows that the authors have not defined properly the meaning or use of a. Note that a is restricted to two-fold contrasts (negative-positive opposition may always serve as half of such a two-fold contrast). Furthermore, in such contrast (English translation 'and') i can serve only to indicate an addition to, or "intimate connection" between, the complex members (often, though far from always, a non-reversible time sequence); that is, the second member always depends on the first, while a contrasts two independent members, including reversible time sequences or simultaneous actions. Very often the replacement of a by i or vice versa makes a radical change of meaning in the Russian sentence. The equally important contrast in viewpoint between no and a (English translation 'but') is not mentioned.

Hildegard Striedter-Temps. Deutsche Lehnwörter im Serbo-kroatischen. (Freie Universität Berlin, Abteilung für slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts (Slavisches Seminar), Veröffentlichungen 18.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1958. xiii, 225, DM 32.

Whereas comprehensive works dealing with German loan words exist for Polish, Czech, and even for Upper Sorbian (Upper Lusatian), this is the first comprehensive work to be undertaken for Serbo-Croatian. Previous studies such as those of Miloš Trivunac and Edmund Schneeweiss incorporated a list of Serbo-Croatian loan words from German, but made no attempt to lay down any phonetic rules illustrated in the process of such borrowing.

The present work does not take into account Germanic words which at a very early stage found their way into Common Slavic nor does it cover German words which passed into Serbo-Croatian via Hungarian. Words of common European vocabulary, such as "auditor," "internist," etc., which are themselves deemed foreign in the German language, are likewise omitted. The author does not claim to have achieved full coverage of German loan words, especially in the non-literary Serbo-Croatian dialects. Nevertheless, she has collected an impressive list of over 1,300 borrowings from German, not to mention their various derivatives.

Part I — Introduction (pp. 1-27) — gives a useful résumé of German-South Slav relations from the earliest German contacts with the Slovenes and Croats in the eighth century until modern times. German links with the Serbs came considerably later, in fact, not until the time of Stefan Nemanja (1151-95). It turns out that the greatest number of borrowings from German dates from the periods of closest contact between Germans and South Slavs, namely that of the organization of the southern frontier of the Holy Roman Empire and that extending from the colonization period of the eighteenth century until the present day.

Part II — Phonetics (pp. 28-98) is of perhaps the greatest interest. It shows the sound correspondences between German and Serbo-Croatian which, in many instances, vary depending on the date of borrowing.

The third and final part (pp. 99-225) is devoted to an alphabetical vocabulary of all the loan words mentioned in the book, together with the original German word and, if established, the date and origin of the borrowing.

This work, which contains a useful reference list of the works consulted (pp. vii-xii), is on the same scholarly level as the previous seventeen which have appeared since 1953 in the series under the general editorship of Max Vasmer.

Alexander W. Wainman
University of British Columbia

Bernard Geiger et al. Peoples and Languages of the Caucasus: A Synopsis. (Janua Linguarum, VI.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959. 77 pp., map, Gld. 8.

During the last thirty years, valuable contributions to the study of the Caucasian peoples have appeared outside the Soviet Union. To linguists and philologists such as Canon Brière, G. Deeters, G. Dumézil, G. Garitte, H. Vogt, to historians such as W. E. D. Allen and D. M. Lang, and to archaeologists such as J. Baltrusaitis, we owe a number of memorable works which, in their respective fields, mark a date in the progress of Caucasian studies.

On the other hand it is surprising that no general descriptive and scholarly reference work has yet appeared on the geographical area which is often called the "Mountain of Languages" (*gora jazykov*) and which is, indeed, both from the linguistic and ethnographical standpoint, of a legendary diversity. Even in such a work as the second and revised edition of Meillet and Cohen's Les Langues du Monde, the Caucasian languages are but superficially dealt with.

It was not surprising, therefore, that when the Human Relations Area Files undertook the investigation of complex and relatively unknown areas of the world, a certain amount of attention was also devoted to the Caucasus. This project benefited from the presence at the Language and Communication Research Center of Columbia University of a number of competent scholars. The result of their research, published in a limited number of mimeographed copies, was an extremely useful accumulation of material, the groundwork — one expected — for more elaborated and thought-out studies.

The work which has just appeared, however, is but a slightly improved version of Vol. I, Chapter III, of the mimeographed edition. It offers, primarily, an ethno-linguistic survey, backed by statistical data, and an ethno-linguistic map of the peoples and languages of the Caucasus. The information contained in this 77-page pamphlet, authored by four scholars, covers basic notions on the geography, the languages and dialects, the religions, the ethnography and traditional economy of the Caucasian peoples. It is, quite simply, as we are apprised in the Preface, an aide-mémoire or synopsis of this field. And when one thinks of the extreme complexity of this small area, as well as of the number of disciplines involved — Iranian, Turkic, Islamic, Slavic, etc. — one appreciates the existence of a guide, however cursory. But the student in linguistics and adjacent disciplines may regret that the useful statistical information collected did not re-emerge as a concise synthesis, of the succinctness and saturation of George Dumézil's Caucasien du Nord et Caucasién du Sud (in the Conférences de l'Institut de Linguistique de Paris, 1934, pp. 25-38) or R. Jakobson's Slavic Languages. His last resort for widening his knowledge of the subject would be to turn to the bibliographical orientation on pp. 71-77, where the emphasis is placed, and rightly so, on sources of bibliographical information.

In such a work, this aspect is, of course, of primary importance. The reviewer will, therefore, be forgiven for suggesting some additions to the list. First of all, the repertory of

books printed in Georgian between 1629 and 1945 should not have been overlooked: Gruzinskaja kniga, 1629-1945 (2 vols., Tbilisi, 1941-51), supplemented by A. Abramišvili, for the years 1629-1920, in Vestnik bibliografii (Tbilisi, 1948, No. 4-5, pp. 109-140). For the periodical literature, moreover, there are several works the omissions of which is even more regrettable: O. Petrosian's Bibliografija armjanskoj periodičeskoj pečati: Armjanskaja bol'shevistskaja pečat': 1902-1920 gg.; Armjanskaja Sovetskaja pečat': 1920-1954 (Erevan, 1954), followed by his bibliography for the years 1794-1900 (Erevan, 1956), and G. I. Bakradze's similar repertory of Georgian periodicals for the years 1819-1945 (Tbilisi, 1947), supplemented by Zercalov's bibliography of the Russian periodicals in Georgia at a most significant period of Russo-Georgian relations, 1828-1920 (Tbilisi, 1941). Of particular interest to scholars will be the recent Ukazatel' statej naučnyx periodičeskix izdanij i sbornikov Tbilisskogo Gos. Universiteta, by A. Kasradze (Tbilisi, 1955), as well as the bibliography relating to Azerbaidžan; A. V. Bagrij, Materialy dlja bibliografii Azerbaidžana (3 vols., Baku, 1924-26). As to the Western bibliography on the Caucasus, it is very inadequate, and the works by Sh. Beridze or A. Salmaslian will be of little use to either the student or the scholar.

One could, of course, multiply titles, but this would involve us in reviewing a work which, unfortunately, it was not the intention of the authors to write. And while we appreciate the quality of the survey under review, we cannot refrain from the hope that it will lead, in a not too distant future, to a more comprehensive treatment of the peoples and languages of the Caucasus.

David Djaparidze
Ecole des Hautes Études (Sorbonne)
and Indiana University

Robert F. Byrnes, ed. The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana. (Slavic and East European Series, Vol. XV.) Indiana Univ. Pub. [n. d.]. xi, 106, \$2.00.

The monograph is a collection of essays presented at the Conference on Non-Western Areas in Indiana Undergraduate Education held at Bloomington in September 1958. All the contributors stress the serious shortcomings in the Indiana system of higher education in acquainting students with the problems of these areas. Supported by carefully prepared statistics, the writers show that in Indiana, and in many other states as well, the ordinary student's familiarity with the languages, history, economics, literature, and general culture of such countries as Russia, China, India, or even the whole continents of Asia and Africa, is alarmingly deficient. Explanations embrace defective training in high school, lack of time provided in the students' prescribed curricula, traditional conservatism in colleges and universities and their governing boards, the absence of trained faculty and, of course, the perennial common denominator, limited funds.

The contributors, all educators keenly aware of the seriousness of the situation and all anxious to seek ways to remedy it, offer solutions both general and specific. These range from Professor Najam's technical recommendations on the improvement of techniques for teaching foreign languages to Professor Byrnes' comprehensive program encompassing reorganization of the curriculum, qualitative and quantitative improvement of language instruction, expansion of library holdings, and a gamut of other measures designed to enrich the students' knowledge of the non-Western world.

Useful as the various prescriptions may be, they treat only the surface symptoms of the malady; it is recognized that they are at best palliatives adopted too late to achieve a complete cure. Most realistic in this connection is William R. Parker's splendid essay entitled "Foreign Languages in American Education," in which the author methodically brings out the capricious, utilitarian, and most partial nature of the remedy offered by the National Defense Education Act in foreign language training. He particularly deplors the utilitarian aim of the bill, tying the teaching of languages directly to our national security requirements. Mr. Parker might have gone a step beyond his criticism of instruction in foreign languages perhaps to indicate that most of the solutions suggested either by the Government or foundations have generally linked them in one way or another to national security requirements and to the development of the "minute-made experts." The reviewer fully supports his view that the cure must start at a much earlier stage in the educational process, or preferably be obviated altogether, by taking preventive steps at the grade school level. However, in the absence of positive measures from those who direct and finance American education from first to second childhood, the reviewer endorses as the best alternative the intelligent recommendations contained in this valuable publication.

Stephen A. Fischer-Galati
Wayne State University

Laurence Schmeckebier. Ivan Meštrović: Sculptor and Patriot. Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse Univ. Press, 1959. vi, 66 + 200 illustrations, \$10.00.

Ivan Meštrović (1883 —), sculptor and patriot, is here again presented to the English speaking world. Ten years earlier, in 1948, Harry Hilbery prepared a superb volume, The Sculpture of Ivan Meštrović, with 158 full-page plates and a short biography. Now Laurence Schmeckebier has written a biographical sketch on Meštrović of 47 pages and 200 illustrations, more or less in chronological order. The particular value of this new publication is that it contains Meštrović's works of the last decade, during which this extraordinary artist (now over seventy-five) has manifested the same creativity and craftsmanship as when he was thirty.

Meštrović seems to have chosen his favorite subject-matter in his youth, before he went to study in Vienna or visited Italy

and the aging Rodin in Paris. In the lonely Dalmatian village of his birth (Otavice), Meštrović had listened to his father, who sang, accompanying himself with the gusle, of the heroic deeds of their ancestors. At the same time he meditated on those biblical passages which evoke the Passion and Crucifixion of Jesus, the Sorrows of His Mother, John the Baptist, and of John the Evangelist. To these first sources of his inspiration Meštrović constantly returned: national and Biblical content predominate in the majority of his works.

Not only the inhabitants of his beloved Split, but also those of Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo, and of other, smaller, cities or even villages of Yugoslavia, can admire, in their parks or in front of their cultural institutions, the statues, busts, and bas-reliefs of famous compatriots, all created by Meštrović. Meštrović's Croatian ancestors, as early as the tenth century, had fought for the right to celebrate mass in the Church Slavic language. Their leader was Gregory, Bishop of Nin. To him Meštrović erected a great monument, which was placed in the perystile of Diocletian's palace (until it was removed by the Italian Fascists). The founder of Modern Croatian literature was Marko Marulić (1450-1524), a native of Split. Meštrović's homage to this philosopher and writer, who fired his countrymen's revolt against the Turks, is eloquently expressed in his sculpture. No one better than Meštrović, this staunch defender of Croatian political rights, propagandised, before and during World War I, the idea of the Serbian Kossovo. One cannot forget his Marko Kraljević or his Maid of Kossovo or his Serbian Widowed Mothers. One of his most recent monuments (done in South Bend, Indiana) is the imposing figure of Bishop Njegoš, the great Serbian poet, erected on Mount Lovćen, Montenegro.

Whereas at the beginning of his career Meštrović concentrated on the violent, protesting, dramatic, terrestrial aspect of our existence (a typical example of this period are his Indians, in Grant Park, Chicago), gradually religious themes came to play an increasingly important role in his works. He found the true representatives of the human race not in the physically powerful, but in those who through sufferings have discovered the meaning of human destiny (i. e., through acceptance, forgiveness, and brotherhood). Hands elevated toward heaven have now the greatest fascination for Meštrović (My Mother at Prayer, Toronto Art Gallery). His vigorous Marko Kraljević should be contrasted with the tortured, dramatic, and sublime Job (executed for Syracuse University). Meštrović is rightly considered the most representative contemporary religious sculptor. His Crucifixions and Pietàs are to be found not only in his own chapel (Meje, Split), in St. Mark's Church (Zagreb), in the Memorial Church of the Račić family in Cavtat, but also in Rome, Washington, South Bend, and in many other places.

Laurence Schmeckebier has written his Introduction as one of the most ardent admirers of Meštrović's art. He often sounds as if he were writing under the dictation of Meštrović himself. But one expects from this conscientious sketch something further. Already in Europe, but especially here in America, questions have been raised, such as: How does Meštrović compare with other modern sculptors? Why is he, after having startled

Yugoslavia and parts of Europe, considered by so many Americans to be too conservative? To what extent may he be called "Rodinesque"? Is he more decorative than dynamic? To these questions, unfortunately, Schmeckeber does not offer any sufficiently substantiated answers.

The other not fully successful feature of this publication is its illustrative material. There is no doubt that, in comparison with the two previous publications by Milan Ćurčin (London, 1919; Zagreb, 1933), Ćurčin's reproductions are far superior. Sometimes one has the impression that the illustrations are only reproductions of already existing plates. Certain illustrations decidedly do not bring out Meštrović's art (e.g., Mila Gojsalić).

It is remarkable how familiar Schmeckeber is with the complicated problems of Croatian or Yugoslav history and politics. His information, except for a few details (e.g., Kačić-Miošić was not born ca. 1740, but in 1706), is usually factual and correct.

Ante Kadić
Indiana University

Serge A. Zenkovsky. Pan-Turkism and Islam in Russia. (Russian Research Center Studies, 36.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1960. xii, 345, \$6.75.

In recent years, several works in English have been devoted to the Muslims inside Russia. Of these, Professor Zenkovsky's book is the best that has appeared to date. The author has a flair for the field and has evinced an intimate knowledge of the Turkic peoples, especially those of Central Asia, the Soviet Middle East. Very few scholars of Russian extraction remain, who have access to Russian and Turkic sources, yet employ American methodology.

Of the eighteen chapters into which this book is divided, the first three provide the necessary historical background. The others cover various aspects of the development and vicissitudes of the Pan-Turk movement among the Kazakhs, Azerbaijani, Uzbeks, Tatars, Bashkirs, etc., and the relation of this movement to Islam in Russia from the Revolution of 1905 through the Bolshevik Revolution to 1920-21. By carrying the record thus far, the author has whetted the appetite of his readers for what is still to come — another volume dealing with the Soviet period.

It is regrettable, as explained in the Preface, that the author has been unable to utilize material published in this field subsequent to the summer of 1957. For this reason, no doubt, although he makes numerous references to Ahmed Zeki Validov (Togan), he includes no reference to the Bashkir leader's role at the Baku Congress of 1920 (p. 250).

Professor Zenkovsky skilfully describes the rise of Russia's Muslims and their struggle for national independence. The impression is given that the only factor they had in common was Islam. Otherwise, they were sharply divided as to what constituted national liberation and Muslim unity.

Of special interest is the struggle between the Musavat

(Equality) and Ittihad (Unity). The ultimate goal of the Musavat was the "liberation of the Turkic peoples and the creation of a new Muslim Turkic empire extending from the Atlantic Ocean and Morocco to the Pacific Ocean and Mongolia, all under the aegis of Constantinople" (p. 101). Ittihad, on the other hand, opposed this ambitious program of Pan-Turkism on the ground that "Islam is cosmopolitan; it is above national Pan-Turkism, and any nationalist creed contradicts this fundamental creed" (p. 273). From this work, it appears that there was a genuine fear on the part of the Shiah ulema that Pan-Turkism, which was based on race, land, and kindred language, would become a menace to Islam.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the Arab nationalists today frequently emphasize that their movement for unity is not based upon the concept of race, but on a common language and religion.

It should occasion no surprise that in the early stages of the Communist regime many Muslims in Russia, including some of their leaders, sympathized with Communist ideology, especially with the idea that Communism was above nationalism and was universal. The author describes with skill the bedlam of nationalistic aspirations that existed among Russia's Muslims when the Soviets first came to power in 1917. The impression was widespread that nationalism could be achieved through Communism and many Muslims hastened to join the Communist Party. Even a leader of reputation, such as Ahmed Zeki Validov (Togan) joined the Communists, albeit reluctantly, in order to secure the independence of the Bashkirs, who in 1939 were estimated to number 843,000.

Of particular value to the specialist in this field is the information provided from primary sources on the first all-Russian Muslim Congress in Moscow, which opened on May 1, 1917. The speeches made by Tsalikov of Daghestan and Resul Zadeh, the Azerbaijani leader, strictly speaking, constitute a blueprint for future Soviet policy for the Russian Muslims and their role abroad (pp. 142-152). This Congress also revealed with startling clarity, in spite of Turkic opposition to Russification, the extent of their integration with the Russians.

Pan-Turkism disintegrated as a movement with the defeat of the Central Powers in World War I, the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire and the secularization of Turkey by Kemal Pasha, and the Bolshevik Revolution, which temporarily opened new vistas for all Muslims. For the development and climax of the Pan-Turk movement in Russia, Professor Zenkovsky has provided a study that scholars in this field will find indispensable.

Ivar Spector
University of Washington

Ul. Hlybinny. Vierzig Jahre weissruthenischer Kultur unter den Sowjets. (Institute zur Erforschung der UdSSR, Monographien, Ser. I, No. 55.) München, 1959. 146 pp.

This is a German translation of the same author's original

Belorussian work which was also published by the Institute for the Study of the USSR (Dola biełaruskaje kultury pad Savietami [München: Instytut dla vyvučennia SSSR, Seryja II — No. 68, 1958, 161 pp.]). However, the last chapter, covering the period "from 1957 until today," was not included in the Belorussian edition.

The material treated here is the same as that in other books published in English during recent years: The Belorussian Theater and Drama by Vladimir Seduro (New York: Research Program on the USSR, 1955), and Opposition to Sovietization in Belorussian Literature by Anthony Adamovich (New York: Scarecrow Press, 1958), for example. Mr. Hlybinny, however, appears to handle the material in a manner which is more journalistic, less accurate, and somewhat controversial.

The "Forty Years of Belorussian Culture under the Soviets" are divided into six periods which are defined chronologically with a more or less acceptable accuracy, but there is an odd prolixity, a certain controversiality, and a journalistic coloring in the terminology (p. 7 and the chapter headings). We find, for example, "the tragic period of the struggle of the Party against Belorussian National Democracy and the national deviations," "the period of the newest proofs of the continuation of the struggle for the individuality of Belorussian culture," or "the period of the relative Renaissance" (actually this "Renaissance" was nothing more than the continuation of the previous development, but under the Soviets), "the period of Stalin's canonization" (a colorful, but journalistic definition). The typical Soviet clichés are used at their face value ("national form," pp. 84, 136, 141, "formalism," p. 95, "ideological errors," pp. 108-109, "national democratic management of agriculture," p. 41, etc.). Sometimes the very treatment smacks of Soviet "self-criticism" ("unmasking" V. Barysienka and I. Hutaraŭ, pp. 112-113). The treatment of the material in the last chapter is so much more detailed than in the previous chapters, that one may be left with an incorrect impression of much more having been done for Belorussian culture after 1957 than even in the twenties.

Factual errors, although perhaps minor, nevertheless seem to be unfortunate in such a book of chiefly informative purport. Thus, for example, Lubamir Rahoŭski (actually Lubomir Rogowski) was a Polish and not a Belorussian composer (p. 5); S. Niekraŭševič was the founder and first President of the Institute of Belorussian Culture before Professor Ihnatoŭski, not after (p. 12); in March 1923 the Twelfth Conference of the Communist Party of Belorussia took place, not the Twelfth All-Union Party Congress (p. 13); A. Balicki never belonged to the "former adherents of the Belorussian People's Republic who returned to the Belorussian SSR" (p. 20); the folk songs were harmonized, not instrumentized, by the Section for Art (p. 27); the mission of Ciška Hartny, Michaś Zarecki, and Michaś Čarot abroad in the summer of 1927 had nothing to do with "scientific purposes" since none of them were in any way connected with science or scholarship (p. 43); the "Central Control Commission" (CKK in Belorussian abbreviation) was mentioned in Ihnatoŭski's letter and not the "Central Executive Committee" (CVK in Belorussian abbreviation, p. 60); among the persons arrested in 1930 Janka Bialkievič should have been mentioned, not Janka Bialevič (p. 63);

the first name of Rodzievič was Leopold, not Leonid (p. 63); Mikoła Azbukin compiled the textbook of European geography, not Belorussian (p. 66); Vasil Šašalevič died in 1942 and was not "liquidated in the basements of the NKVD in 1936" (p. 78); Kupala's book was called Bieznazoŭnaje, not Beznazoŭny (in German translation — Das Namenlose, not Der Namenlose, p. 123); only Volume II of Karski's Belorusy was reprinted, not the entire work (p. 135); Taraškievič's and Losik's terminology was always used in Soviet textbooks, not recently "reintroduced" (p. 140).

The translation into German is sometimes inaccurate (Gedicht for Belorussian paema, i. e., 'long poem,' pp. 36, 79, 80, 88; Erinnerungen for Belorussian Zapiski — German Skizzen, i. e., 'Notes,' p. 37; Dokumente for Matarjały — Materialien, i. e., 'Materials,' p. 70; Heimaterde for ziamla, 'Land'; Kryptographie, while Schlüsselliteratur is in common use in German, p. 85). Many Belorussian words, especially proper names, are transliterated inadequately (Horadno, instead of Horadzien, or Horadnia, Russian Grodno, p. 133; Zaparač instead of Paparač, p. 137; Makajonok instead of Makajonak, p. 144, etc.).

Nevertheless, in spite of these shortcomings, if the reader has been adequately warned against them, Mr. Hlybinny's book may be useful as a source of information on the history of Belorussian culture, a subject which is only very slightly known in the West.

Anthony Adamovich
New York

Vilho Niitemaa. Baltian historia. (Historiallinen Kirjasto, XVI.) Porvoo-Helsinki: Werner Söderström, 1959. 421 pp.

It is a misfortune to be a good historian in a small country, the language of which is not widely understood in the outer world. Dr. Niitemaa's latest work, covering the history of the Estonian-Latvian area from the earliest times through the Second World War, is certainly good enough to be published in some language in which it would be more accessible to the scholars of the world. Since the author has already produced at least two books in German dealing with Livonian medieval history, it is to be hoped he will make this work, too, available to a wider circle of readers. It is the best existing book on the history of the Baltikum; indeed, it is the only recent one, except Reinhard Wittram's Baltische Geschichte (1954).

Dr. Niitemaa has accomplished admirably the difficult task of organizing, condensing, and presenting judiciously an extremely complicated history, in which there are still a number of hotly debated issues. He is particularly strong in social and economic history and in placing Livonian developments in their international setting. He is skillful in giving an orderly exposition of the dissolution and partition of the Livonian state and in tracing the rise of nationalism and the conflict of Russian, Baltic-German, and Latvian and Estonian nationalisms in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. His Finnish background

enables him to make a fresh approach, and he occasionally offers illuminating correlations between Finnish and Livonian history. The book contains a long and useful bibliography (about which some reservations will presently be made) and several good maps. Dr. Niitemaa follows the deplorable European practice of not providing a full index, but only an "Index of Persons" and an "Index of Places." The former, however, identifies every person by title and gives the dates of birth and death and, in the case of a ruler, of his reign.

Any adverse criticism of this book must deal with the manner of writing, or with the author's interpretation of, or emphasis upon, points on which opinion differs, or with what he felt he had to omit in a work which represents a masterpiece of condensation. I confess that I feel the author is almost too correct and too impartial in his journey through history. His book is so factual as to border on dryness, and it lacks the color and warmth of some of the classic writings in the field. I regret that he did not pay more attention to cultural history. I wish he had made more use of the book by his fellow-countryman, Gustav Adolf Donner, Kardinal Wilhelm von Sabina (1929) and, like that writer, had pointed out the Grand Design of the Papacy early in the thirteenth century not only to convert the pagans in northeastern Europe but also to set up a state free of Imperial interference and to impose Catholicism on Orthodox Novgorod and as much of the rest of Russia as possible.

I think that Dr. Niitemaa follows too much the old medieval Catholic and modern German line in underestimating the extent of Russian missionary activity before the German conquest (a subject which the Latvian scholar Adamovičs has treated illuminatingly). I consider the discussion of Ivan IV and his motives rather meager and unsatisfying. I wish that the connection between the rise of an export trade in grain and the growth of serfdom in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries had been made clearer.

And, finally, there is the matter of the bibliography. It may seem captious to complain in any way about a systematic bibliography which runs to sixteen pages and includes works in nine languages. After all, the literature of the field is immense, and the author had to make a more or less arbitrary selection. Nevertheless, one notes the absence of a number of important titles. Even more regrettable is the national imbalance. There is apparently not one title of a Polish work listed, and there are very few Russian ones, though Polish and Russian scholars have made important contributions to the field. English-language references are strikingly deficient. Perhaps the most glaring omission is that of the writings of Professor Walther Kirchner, especially his book The Rise of Baltic Question. But bibliographical carping is the last refuge of the pedant, and the hobgoblin of small minds. Dr. Niitemaa's work is solid enough to survive such relatively minor objections.

C. Leonard Lundin
Indiana University

Alfred E. Senn. The Emergence of Modern Lithuania. (Studies of the Russian Institute.) New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1959. xi, 272, \$6.00.

This book is a detailed political study of the first four years in the history of the Lithuanian people when, at the end of World War One, it embarked upon the seemingly impossible task of establishing the Independent Republic of Lithuania.

Much has been written about the formation of the three Baltic Republics during the past four decades, especially after their final absorption by Soviet Russia at the end of World War Two. What makes this study outstanding is that it has attempted to make and I believe succeeded in making an objective analysis of the most complicated and most controversial of them all: Lithuania. The Estonians and Latvians received the sympathies of the Western World in their struggle for independence against Bolshevism and Pan-Germanism, both enemies of the Entente, but the birth of Lithuania was overshadowed by the seemingly pro-Lithuanian attitude of Imperial Germany and the hostility of the newly born Republic of Poland.

It was the tragic geographic situation that put Lithuanian aspirations for statehood at the mercy of Germany. Strategically located between Germany and Russia and flanked by Poland, the Lithuanians found themselves pressurized from all three sides: in the east from the Bolsheviks, whose aim was complete incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Russian Federation; in the south and southeast from the Poles, who gave the Lithuanians little choice, since the Polish Government offered them either nominal independence with Vilno as a capital within a Polish-Lithuanian Federation or threatened them with complete annexation. Under such circumstances Germany's recognition of Lithuania as an allied state was the least of the three evils and the only road to independence. This German tag to Lithuanian sovereignty gave rise to suspicion among the Entente that Lithuania was to become a German puppet state. Actually German support for Lithuanian statehood was not based upon German altruism but rather upon the latter's belief that independent Lithuania would serve best as a buffer state against Bolshevik Russia as well as against the growing nationalistic appetite of Poland.

In his handling of the Vilno dispute the author maintains objectivity by pointing out the weaker historic Lithuanian claims and the stronger ethnic Polish claims to Vilno. In his final chapter the author gives his opinion about the causes for Lithuania's success on its road to independence.

Dr. Senn believes that Lithuania was "an outgrowth of the Russian Revolutions, a by-product of the First World War, and a reflection of the twentieth century Zeitgeist of democracy and national self-determination." He denounces the theories that Lithuania was the product of the Lithuanian's own struggle or that Lithuania was the creation of Germany. He definitely believes that although the conquest of Vilno by the Poles cut short Lithuania's geographic aspirations, it did prevent Lithuania's absorption by the Bolsheviks, who were eventually stopped by the Poles on the Vistula. The theory that Bolshevik recognition of Lithuania safeguarded her independence the author believes fallacious, for a similar treaty between Bolshevik Russia and

Georgia did not stop Georgia from being infiltrated and conquered by Bolshevik Russia.

Dr. Senn's well-balanced facts and his illumination of a very controversial period in Eastern European history are not only a contribution to historic scholarship but also show his broad erudition as both historian and linguist in his utilization of the huge multilingual primary and secondary sources upon which this book is based.

Emanuel Nodel
Maryland State College

Frank Gibney. The Frozen Revolution: A Study in Communist Decay. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy [c. 1959]. xiv, 269, \$4.75.

S. L. Shneiderman. The Warsaw Heresy. New York: Horizon Press [c. 1959]. 253 pp., \$4.95.

These two books dealing with the problems of contemporary Poland have a great deal in common, and yet they contrast forcibly in many ways. Both are written by journalists, one a native American and the other Polish-born, both cover similar ground, and both reach fundamentally the same conclusion. Here similarities end and differences of approach come to the fore.

Frank Gibney in his treatment of the Polish scene uses the skill of a widely travelled political journalist who can observe shrewdly and describe brilliantly any country he investigates. Shneiderman, born and educated in Warsaw, writes with a great deal of insight and the instinct of a native, and at times one regrets that he does not exploit more fully this advantage rather than to try to take the detached attitude of an outside observer.

Gibney's Frozen Revolution offers a picture of Poland which is generally convincing. The author attempts to deal with all major aspects of Polish life after the October Revolution of 1956. Thus he discusses the problem of Gomulka and the Communist party, the position of Cardinal Wyszyński and the Catholic church, importance of the intellectual revolt, economic issues, and Poland's western territories. Special chapters are devoted to the infamous Nazi concentration camp of Oświęcim (Auschwitz) and to the impact of Poland's recent history on the present situation. His entire study is well balanced, although this reviewer would wish to see the discussion of the German occupation at the very beginning of the book, because without understanding the story of the Nazi rule in Poland one can hardly appreciate the realities after 1945. Gibney's book is clearly a study by an outsider written for a public which has only a vague notion of Polish problems. This characteristic makes it naturally of limited value to a specialist, or even to a conscientious reader of such penetrating articles as those by Grueson, Rosenthal, or Flora Lewis, which have appeared in the New York Times. But Frank Gibney makes no claim to be a student of Polish history or Polish affairs. All in all he has accomplished a fine job of journalistic reporting,

and his talents as an observer and a writer make his book highly readable and interesting.

In contrast to Gibney, Shneiderman — the author of the second book under review here — while attempting to present also a general picture, is at his best when dealing with specific issues which are either close to his heart or which he instinctively understands. Shneiderman's drawing of political figures such as the hated ex-chief of the Secret Police, Rożanski, or the virtual dictator of Poland in the Stalinist days, Jakub Berman, is most interesting. His descriptions of Polish western territories or of the city of Czestochowa are penetrating and revealing. He writes well and with evident sentiment about the remnants of Jewish life in Poland, and his stories of the ghettos are moving. Shneiderman's analysis of economic problems is also on the whole superior to that of Gibney, for he is better prepared to discuss these complex issues.

At the same time the author of The Warsaw Heresy is occasionally careless, and one is astonished to find historical and geographical errors in a book written by someone born and raised in Poland. Shneiderman calls Mieszko the first king of Poland and says that the date 963 refers to his crowning; he makes Poznan the capital of Pomerania; and he gives the figure of 32,000,000 people as Poland's population in 1939. Such carelessness raises doubt as to the accuracy of his reporting on contemporary Poland, and one wonders whether Shneiderman always draws a judicial line between fact and gossip. On the whole The Warsaw Heresy is an uneven book in which personal observation mingles with general discussion; it is less of a complete study of the problem than Gibney's work, and more of a series of disjointed reports and analyses. This does not detract from its value as stimulating reading, and Shneiderman's book has a freshness and a directness which is absorbing and appealing.

Both authors end their words on contemporary Poland with cautious conclusions in which they indicate that the gains of October are likely to remain in one form or another and that the Polish Communist experiment will not collapse. Developments which have taken place in Poland since publication of The Warsaw Heresy and the Frozen Revolution show that the two writers were wise not to indulge in long-range predictions. Even now some of their observations seem obsolete, and what the future will bring no one can foretell. In spite of this, or perhaps because of it, the two books under review deserve to be read carefully by the American public so as to gain a better understanding of the present problems of Poland. The importance of those problems for the Soviet bloc is altogether evident today.

Piotr S. Wandycz
Indiana University

William I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki. The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. 2 vols. New York: Dover Pubs. [n.d.]. xv, 1114; vi, 1115-2250; \$12.50.

This massive work is a classic of sociology. First published

in 1918-1920 in five volumes and several times reprinted — the present edition is an unabridged republication of the second edition — it results from the collaboration of two well-known sociologists, one Polish, the other American. It holds an assured place in the history of sociological thought. It also contains a mine of invaluable documentation for Polish social history, sources which have hitherto scarcely been touched by Polish historians. The greater part of the illustrative material, as well as of the authors' introductions to the various sections, is in fact concerned with peasant life in Poland itself. So far as I know, the work has never been published in a Polish version. The fact that original sources for Polish history are so scantily represented in English translation gives it additional value for English-speaking scholars.

The first volume of the present edition (on primary group organization) contains 764 letters exchanged, for the most part, between immigrants and their families back in Poland; and these letters were chosen out of a total of some 10,000 collected by the authors. Most of the writers came from a peasant background, while several belonged to the urban artisan class or to that peculiarly Polish social group of the "peasant nobility" or were manor servants; and the letters were all written in the first fourteen years of this century. The Polish peasant is a frequent and lengthy letter writer; all his letters can be reduced to one or another of a basic category called by the authors the "bowing" letter, which serves to give expression to "familial solidarity" between members divided in space.

The source material in the second volume of the present edition (on disorganization and reorganization in Poland and America) is of a somewhat different, and perhaps less original, character. The documents deriving from Poland are largely made up of extracts from peasant newspapers in the Congress Kingdom, in particular the rather conservative Gazeta Świąteczna and the radical Zaranie, and from the archives of the Emigrants Protective Society in Warsaw, of which Znaniecki himself was director at the time of the initiation of the study. The American material is taken mainly from court records and the archives of charitable societies and Polish parishes. At the end is printed a detailed and fascinating autobiography of a Polish immigrant of peasant origin, "a typical representative of the culturally passive mass which . . . constitutes in every civilized society the enormous majority of the population."

The present work is essentially a study in social disintegration, the dissolution of the traditional and static Polish peasant community as a result of the impact of new and dynamic movements like industrialism and immigration, and in subsequent social reorganization as fresh positive forces — new leadership, the spread of popular education and press, co-operative institutions, and the growth of national and political consciousness among a hitherto inert mass — come into play. Especially valuable for the historian of Polish society and culture is the lengthy introduction to the first volume covering some 215 pages and representing an analysis and systematic arrangement of a considerable amount of original source material. Here we see the life of the Polish village both before and after elements of dissolution have got to work on the traditional framework. The

character of the "family group" and the smaller "marriage-group," and the complicated relationships existing within them which form the basis of "familial solidarity," are gradually altered with increasing personal individualization. One of the most important subjects treated is that of social classes in Polish society. The gradual disintegration of the old rigid hierarchy takes place as a result of such factors as the political oppression of the partitioning powers, industrialization and the agrarian crisis of the late nineteenth century, and the spread of democratic and revolutionary ideas from above. This leads both to a transformation of the "social environment" of the Polish peasant, who in many cases ceases to be a merely passive, and becomes an active, member of the national community, and to a radical alteration in prevailing attitudes to authority and in the traditional loyalties.

The authors give an illuminating account of the economic life of the village. Here of course it is the land that is all-important in the peasant way of life. At the turn of the century, land hunger was the overriding issue facing the Polish peasant, and emigration was closely related to this problem. The authors throw much light on such questions as: who emigrated, and why did they go, and in what circumstances; what were the relations between the emigrants and those who stayed behind; what effect did their new environment have on the immigrants; etc. Considerable attention is devoted also to the religious and magical attitudes of the peasantry, the authors basing their account largely on the work of Kolberg and later Polish ethnographers, as well as on the data assembled in the present volumes. Perhaps today the less satisfactory parts of the work are those in the second volume on the political side of the peasant movement where the source material used by the authors is limited, and where a considerable number of monographs, etc., on the subject have been published in Poland over the last four decades. Nevertheless here, too, there is much acute comment and analysis.

I hope that it will not be only sociologists who will continue the study of Thomas and Znaniecki's volumes. Not only do they make absorbing reading. As I have attempted to show, they are of primary importance for any students and teachers of Polish history and culture, who are interested in the development of Polish society in recent times.

Peter Brock
University of Alberta

BRIEF NOTICES

Ivan Turgenev. Three Famous Plays. Tr. Constance Garnett. (A Mermaid Dramabook.) New York: Hill and Wang [1959]. xiii, 235, \$1.25.

A Month in the Country, A Provincial Lady and A Poor Gentleman (the last incorrectly dated 1841 instead of 1848) are here once again conveniently available. The main attraction of the volume lies in Mrs. Garnett's complete translation of A Month in the Country which, if stylistically less felicitous than Emyln Williams

stage version (1943) presents much more accurately the play Turgenev wrote. The plays are prefixed by David Garnett's brief rhapsody on Turnenev's life and stature. It does not deal with his dramatic works.

Ralph E. Matlaw
Princeton University

Kleine slavische Biographie. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1958. vii, 832, DM 34.

This small encyclopedia of Slavic culture contains short biographies of those who have contributed substantially to that culture. It is the collective effort of the Slavic Seminar of the University of Munich with the co-operation of the Belorussian Institute. The editors have included not only representatives of the humanities, but also outstanding contributors to the fields of scientific knowledge.

The compilation of these biographies in miniature, in its own way, must have been an exacting task. After the essential data of birth and death (where pertinent), the compiler had to characterize briefly the subject's contribution to Slavic culture. The subject's major contribution is then usually mentioned. Most entries conclude with a reference or references to source material for further information.

The whole is concluded with a selected bibliography of additional materials and standard works in various cultural fields.

One can always dispute the choice for any selective compilation. This one seems to be thorough and proportionate. Aleksandr Puškin and Lev Tolstoj get their due space; Boris Pasternak and Artur Rubinstein are not overlooked. However, one does wonder why Lev Karsavin, Joannes Kepler, Jan Lasicki, Jan Otrębski, to name some, were not included. Despite this debatable shortcoming, Kleine slavische Biographie, as a quick reference manual, will be near the hand of many interested in the field of Slavic culture.

Walter C. Jaskiewicz
Fordham University

George Vernadsky. The Origins of Russia. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959. xi, 354, \$5.60.

This volume by the distinguished emeritus professor of Yale University is a study of the early background of the history of the Slavs and the Russes and of the formation of the Russian state. In some ways, it is a revision of Professor Vernadsky's Ancient Russia, published in 1943 as the first volume of the projected eight-volume A History of Russia begun then by Professor Vernadsky and the late Michael Karpovich of Harvard University. The last part of The Origins of Russia, which deals with the religious foundations of old Russian culture, is based on

Vernadsky's second volume in the eight-volume series, Kievan Russia, which was published in 1953.

This book deals with a critical period in the history of the Slavs, one about which all specialists on Russia and Eastern Europe ought to be better informed. It describes the early migrations of the Slavs and the Russes, their political and social organization, primitive Slavic culture, the coming of the Varangians to Russia, the 860-861 attack on Constantinople, early Byzantine influence, and the conversion of Vladimir and its effects.

This is a book for specialists. It is marked by Professor Vernadsky's enormous range of knowledge and by his willingness confidently to express unorthodox views. His daring speculations, based on interpretations of linguistic evidence which are not widely accepted, are among the great services to the profession which a senior scholar such as Vernadsky can best provide.

The book, alas, lacks maps, which would have been most useful.

George Vernadsky. Russia at the Dawn of the Modern Age. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959. ix, 347, \$7.50.

This volume, which is the fourth in the projected eight-volume A History of Russia by Professor Vernadsky of Yale University and the late Michael Karpovich of Harvard University, covers the exciting period in Russian history from the middle of the fifteenth century until the church union of Brest in 1596, at the end of the sixteenth century.

During these years, the consolidated Muscovite state began the expansion which has been a feature of Russian history since that time. This volume treats two phases of that expansion, the unification of Great Russia under Ivan III and Vasiliij III and Muscovite acquisition over Belorussia and the Ukraine, which led to conflict with Catholic Poland. Professor Vernadsky will treat the evolution of the Muscovite state organization and Russian culture in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in the next volume.

This volume, as all of Professor Vernadsky's work as a mature scholar, is distinguished by great erudition and careful research. It also contains eight clear maps, an excellent bibliography, and clear genealogical tables. Every college library and every serious student of Russian history and culture should obtain this volume and the other volumes of A History of Russia.

Robert F. Byrnes
Indiana University

Boleslaw Szczesniak, tr. and ed. The Russian Revolution and Religion: A Collection of Documents Concerning the Suppression of Religion by the Communists, 1917-1925. Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1959. xx, 289, \$6.75.

Although numberless books and articles have been produced about the Russian Communist Revolution, there is a scarcity of

published primary sources for the study of the suppression of religion during the Revolution (1917-25). A collection of such documents, for the most part inaccessible to the Western reader, is one of the most needed reference books. In this respect, Szczesniak has done an excellent job. He has included here a set of important documents pertinent to this question, selecting them from archivist depositories and private collections of significance. In addition, the collection includes translations from official or rare Russian publications (such as laws and executive orders of the Bolshevik government and the All-Russian Communist Party; the most interesting articles from the newspapers Pravda, Izvestija, Krasnaja Zvezda, Bezbožnik, and selections from Antireligioznik, and other Communist Russian publications of a pertinent character). In addition, the appendices provide lists of anti-religious laws; list of deported, tortured, or murdered bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church; lists of desecrated relics and bodies of the Orthodox saints; short biographical sketches on some Orthodox and Catholic ecclesiastics; statistical data; and a selective, but substantial, bibliography of the subject. An indispensable volume!

Alexander Dallin, comp. Soviet Conduct in World Affairs: A Selection of Readings. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. x, 318, \$4.50.

Dallin admits that this present selection of readings "is not intended to remedy the absence of a satisfactory textbook on Soviet policy" and that "its purpose is neither to present new facts nor to offer a novel hypothesis" (p. ix.). However, neither is this a good textbook and nor does it offer anything new at all. If anything, its outstanding feature are some glaring omissions of the fields which should have been covered, and especially such topics as the concepts of Soviet geopolitics; the operation of the Comintern, Cominform, and numerous other organizations organized along this line; the control of the Soviet satellites and their use in international politics; the struggle for the underdeveloped countries; the strategy in the nuclear age; etc. In spite of the reputation of the editor and his effort to cover here the motives of Soviet policy-makers, the trends of Soviet development, domestic as well as foreign, and the implications of these for United States (or generally "Western") attitudes and policies, the present collection is, as a whole, quite disappointing.

Abraham Rothberg, ed. Anatomy of a Moral: The Political Essays of Milovan Djilas. Intr. Paul Willen. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 181 pp., \$2.95.

This series of eighteen articles by Djilas, brought together here for the first time in English translation, appeared in the Belgrade Communist newspaper Borba in the closing months of 1953. They show the intellectual somersault by which Djilas, at that time the second-ranking Communist in Yugoslavia, alienated himself from the Yugoslav Communist movement after seventeen years of leadership. The result was a temporary political crisis in Yugoslavia, which was joyfully welcomed in

the West, as it turned out to be a definite proof of the bitter disillusionment of a leading Communist ideologist with practical consequences of the Marxian system, especially by showing the brutal mechanics of Communist power. While socialist content had been achieved, Djilas claimed, socialist form had become glaringly absent from Yugoslavia's life. This thesis is presented within the framework of the theme stressing the inevitable eruption of elemental human force, essentially good in character, breaking through the codified dogma and rigid social custom imposed from some source foreign to man's essential nature. These spontaneous forces need no governmental supervision, but only an open society, breathing space for genuine creativity, and direct and open contact among friends. On the whole, Djilas' espousal of the elementary premises of a democratic society are a logical counterpart of his ever-broadening conception of a free society. For these views, Djilas has been in prison since 1956.

Joseph S. Roucek
University of Bridgeport

John A. Arnez. Slovenia in European Affairs: Reflections on Slovenian Political History. New York, Washington: League of CSA, 1958. x, 204 pp.

This book is a story of a small nation surrounded by powerful empires. The politics of such a nation seems to have been determined by its desire to preserve its ethnic identity and cultural autonomy against irredentistic and imperialistic designs of its neighbors. The book begins with an analysis of the strategic importance of the territory on which the Slovenes are settled. The following chapters give a detailed account of the struggle of the Slovenes to preserve their unity and their political rights, a struggle which often dictated an opportunistic attitude in politics, particularly in the role of the Slovenes have played in pre-World War II Yugoslavia. The author stresses that this opportunism has been imperative from the point of view of Slovene national interests. But he also emphasizes the desire of the Slovenes for political independence, if such an independence could be achieved without territorial losses and without fear of military or economic aggression on the part of the neighbors. It is possible that after the downfall of the Communist regime in Eastern Europe, such aspirations might be realized in a united and free commonwealth of European nations.

D. A. Tomasic
Indiana University

Tibor Meray. Thirteen Days That Shook the Kremlin. Tr. Howard L. Katzander. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. vii, 290, \$5.00.

This is a vivid journalistic study of Imre Nagy and the Hungarian revolution of October-November 1956, by a former Hungarian Communist journalist who was a participant in the events of the thirteen colossal days. He depicts the birth and growth of the revolt, the vain efforts of the regime to stem the revolutionary tide, and, finally, the uprising itself. The book is an important addition to the literature of enduring interest on what was, perhaps, the most truly popular revolution of the twentieth century.

Robert C. Tucker
Indiana University

BOOKS RECEIVED

- George Z. F. Bereday and Jaan Pennar. The Politics of Soviet Education. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1960]. vi, 217, \$6.00.
- Cyril E. Black and John M. Thompson, ed. American Teaching about Russia. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press [c. 1959]. 189 pp., \$4.50.
- Kazimierz Bulas and Francis J. Whitfield. The Kościuszko Foundation Dictionary, Vol. I: English-Polish. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1959. xii, 1037, \$10.00.
- George E. Condoyannis. Scientific Russian. New York: John Wiley and Sons [c. 1959]. xii, 225, \$3.50.
- William S. Cornyn. Beginning Russian. Temporary Revised Edition. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1959. v, 357, \$3.95.
- Peter Deriabin and Frank Gibney. The Secret World. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1959. 334 pp., \$4.50.
- John Dewey. Dictionary of Education. Ed. Ralph B. Winn. New York: Philosophical Library [c. 1959]. x, 150, \$3.75.
- A. M. van der Eng-Liedmeier. Soviet Literary Characters: An Investigation into the Portrayal of Soviet Men in Russian Prose 1917-1953. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, XXIX.) 'S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959. 174 pp., Gld. 16.
- Noah D. Gershevsky. Scientific Russian Reader: Selected Modern Readings in Chemistry and Physics. New York: Pitman Publ. Corp. [c. 1960]. xxii, 266.
- Brisson D. Gooch. The New Bonapartist Generals in the Crimean War: Distrust and Decision-Making in the Anglo-French Alliance. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959. ii, 289, Guilders 19.
- George C. Guins. Communism on the Deline. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. ix, 287 pp.
- Johannes Holthusen and Dmitrij Tschizewskij. Versdichtung der russischen Symbolisten: Ein Lesebuch. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, 5/6.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. 135 pp., DM 8.80.

- Alex Inkeles and Raymond A. Bauer. The Soviet Citizen: Daily Life in a Totalitarian Society. (Russian Research Center Studies 35.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. xx, 533, \$10.00.
- N. M. Karamzin. A Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia: The Russian Text. Ed. Richard Pipes. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1959. viii, 119 pp.
- Nikolai Khokhlov. In the Name of Conscience. New York: David McKay Co. [c. 1959]. xi, 365, \$4.50.
- Jozsef Kovago. You Are All Alone. New York: F. A. Praeger [c. 1959]. 295 pp., \$6.00.
- Isaac Don Levine. The Mind of an Assassin. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy [c. 1959]. xvii, 232, \$4.50.
- Thais S. Lindstrom. Manual of Beginning Russian. New York: American Book Company [c. 1959]. viii, 152, \$3.75.
- Nicholas Maltzoff. Pattern Drills in Russian. New York: Pitman Publ. Corporation [c. 1960]. viii, 72 pp.
- Irene Nowikowa. Die Namen der Nagetiere im Ostslavischen. (Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts [Slavisches Seminar], 19.) Berlin: Die Freie Universität, 1959. xv, 152, DM 26. In Kommission bei Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- A. P. Okladnikov. Ancient Population of Siberia and Its Cultures. (Russian Translation Series of the Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard Univ., Vol. I, No. 1.) Cambridge, Mass., 1959. vii, 96 pp.
- Joseph Paucó. Unconquerables. Tr. from the Slovak by Andrew Bachleda. New York: Vantage Press [c. 1958].
- S. P. Platonov et al., ed. Vtoraja mirovaja vojna 1939-1945 gg.: Voenno-istoričeskij očerk. 2 vols. Moskva: Voennoe izdatel'stvo Min. Ob. SSSR, 1958. 931 pp., 32 maps. (Review copy supplied by Telberg Book Co., 544 Sixth Ave., New York.)
- Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855. (Russian and East European Studies.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1959. x, 296, \$5.00.
- W. W. Rostow. The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1960. xi, 179, \$1.45.
- Linda Sadnik. Slavische Akzentuation, I: Die Vorhistorische Zeit. (Bibliotheca Slavica.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959. xvi, 172, DM 22.
- C. H. van Schooneveld. A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, VII.) S-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1959. xi, 171 pp.
- N. C. Stepanoff. Say It in Russian. 3rd ed. New York: Dover Publ., Inc. [c. 1958]. 175 pp., \$.75.
- Leon Stilman. Graded Readings in Russian History: The Formation of the Russian State. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1960. viii, 93, \$2.50.
- Wiktor Sukiennicki. Kolumbowy błąd: Szkice z historii, teorii i

praktyki sowieckiego "komunizmu." (Biblioteka "Kultury," tom XLVIII.) Paris: Instytut Literacki, 1959. 205 pp.

Dmitrij Tschiżewskij. Formalistische Dichtung bei den Slaven. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, 3.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1958. 60 pp., DM 5.80.

Dmitrij Tschiżewskij. Zwei russisch-kirchenslavische Texte. (Heidelberger Slavische Texte, 4.) Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1958. 31 pp., DM 4.

Avrahm Yarmolinsky. Road to Revolution: A Century of Russian Radicalism. New York: Macmillan Co., 1959. xiv, 369, \$5.95.

Eugene Zamiatin. We. Tr. Gregory Zilboorg. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1959. xxix, 218, \$1.45.

Szczepan K. Zimmer. Stanisław Wyspiański: A Biographical Sketch. Tr. Halina M. Zimmer. Essen, Germany: Leopold Sanicki, 1959. 92 pp.

NEWS AND NOTES

AATSEEL Teacher Placement Bureau Set Up

The AATSEEL Teacher Placement Bureau has been set up. Its Director of Professor Deming Brown, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Like the employment agencies of the other AAT's, the AATSEEL Teacher Placement Bureau must be self-supporting. Hence all members of the AATSEEL — and members only — are eligible to register, for \$10.00 per year. The service is free of charge for institutions seeking teachers in the field of Russian and other Slavic and East European languages and literatures, on the secondary and college and university levels.

The AATSEEL Teacher Placement Bureau has facilities for making available to prospective employers the credentials, transcripts, and letters of recommendation for teachers or prospective teachers seeking new or better positions. This service promises greatly to help individuals seeking positions and institutions seeking teachers. Its use is invited, and it should be recommended to prospective teachers.

The AATSEEL Teacher Placement Bureau has been set up pursuant to the action of the Executive Council at its 1959 annual meeting (see the Spring 1960 issue of the Journal, p. 88). Now that this service is provided, the Journal will no longer print "Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available."

Report of the Chairman of the Committee for the Promotion of Slavic and East European Languages in Secondary Schools

The following new members have been added to the committee: Norman Henley, Johns Hopkins Univ.; Anthony Hull, Univ. of Alabama; Edward Jamosky, Nicolet High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Hugh McLean, Univ. of Chicago; Lawrence Thompson, Univ. of Washington; Mrs. Marjorie McDonald, Portland, Oregon.

The most important activity of the Committee since the Chicago meeting in December 1959 was the checking of the U.S. Office of Education lists of secondary schools in all states which have a Russian program. [The list, compiled by Miss Ilo Remer, of the U.S. Office of Education, is published in this issue of the Journal, pp. 158-165. — Ed.]

Clearing House. Until the setting up of the AATSEEL
SEEJ, New Series, Vol. IV (XVIII) (1960)

Teacher Placement Bureau, the office of the Chairman has served as an unofficial placement bureau, bringing together unemployed teachers of Russian and institutions seeking teachers. The information we seek on the status of Russian in secondary schools is being constantly channeled to many inquiring educators and members of the press. The demand for qualified personnel in the Slavic language field is ever-growing, and the lack of qualified teachers is the only stumbling block impeding the increase in the number of schools offering Russian. The U.S. Registry of Junior and Senior High School Modern Language Teaching Personnel maintained by the National Science Teachers Association (NEA) for the MLA lists 373 teachers of Russian for 1960.

CEEB Russian Exam. The College Entrance Examination Board has just appointed a committee to study the need for an examination in Russian and to prepare one for possible use in spring 1961. The Committee members are: Richard Burgi, Yale, chairman; Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar; Valentine Tschebotarioff Bill, Princeton; Rostislav Rozdestvensky, Glastonbury Public Schools, Connecticut; Mrs. Claire Walker, Friends School, Baltimore, Maryland.

AAT Co-ordinators. Several of our members have been active in the AAT organizations. With the co-operation of the five AAT's, there is a network of co-ordinators in every state. Your chairman, as national co-ordinator for AATSEEL, was present at their meeting in Chicago and learned much from the experience. The Slavic field is still pretty much outside the experience of most of the Foreign Language co-ordinators. The chairman feels that the contacts made at this meeting will be of great value in the future work of the Committee.

The co-ordinators are expected to establish and maintain contact with one another and to co-operate with the state FL consultant or supervisor. In states that have not yet appointed a consultant, the co-ordinators can act as an advisory committee in the selection of a consultant. Twenty-eight states and the District of Columbia already have consultants, and they met in Chicago last December to exchange ideas and experience.

Report of the Russian Committee of the Independent School Education Board. Mrs. Claire Walker reports a lively meeting of this committee at the Annual Conference of the Independent Schools Education Board in New York in March. Mischa Fayer and Andre von Gronicka spoke on "The Trials and Tribulations of Perfecting Teaching Methods in Russian."

The Committee has prepared the following materials in Russian: 1959 Examination 1 (member schools 10¢, non-members, 20¢); 1960 Examinations 1 and 2 in one booklet (20¢, 25¢); Syllabus for 1 and 2 (25¢ for non-members); Word List 1 (10¢) and Word List 2 (15¢). Checks may be made to Mrs. Walker at Friends School, Baltimore 10, Maryland.

Summer Schools and Institutes in Russian. Of the 35 NDEA Institutes in operation during the summer of 1960, two will have a Russian language section: Northwestern University (June 27-August 19); Dartmouth College (July 1-August 18). The only full academic year NDEA Russian Language Institute for

Secondary Teachers will be held at Indiana University from September 15, 1960, to May 25, 1961; its 1960-61 program provides special training for two groups: (1) American secondary school teachers who have professional training and experience but lack an adequate command of Russian; and (2) native speakers of Russian who lack the training needed for certification as secondary-school teachers of Russian.

A special feature of the University of Michigan summer program and of Indiana University's Russian Workshop this summer is a thirty-day study tour of the Soviet Union, for four semester hours of credit, after completion of a specially designed eight-week summer program (for eight or nine semester hours credit) to prepare students for this trip.

The Choate School, Wallingford, Conn., is again offering a Summer Program of Russian Studies this summer, with a six-weeks summer session from July 6 to August 17, and then a Russian trip from August 17 to September 19. Mr. J. van Straalen reports that last summer's program was very successful. Of the 27 students enrolled in the Studies Program, 25 went on the trip to Russia and the majority of them are continuing Russian in college or in high school.

Helen B. Yakobson

Programs of FL Studies

On February 19 and 20 at the MLA offices gathered a group of FL teachers nominated by the five AAT's to prepare five Guides for the college student of French, German, Italian, Russian and other Slavic Languages, Spanish and Portuguese. The AATSP published "A Guide for the Spanish Major" in Hispania (May 1955) and the conferees met to establish criteria and working schedules for the publication of a revised Spanish Guide and for the creation of Guides in the other four fields. It was decided to broaden the scope and target of these Guides by giving them, as a main title, "A Program of French [Germanic, Italian, Slavic, Hispanic] Studies." It is hoped that the "Programs" can be published in the spring 1961 issues of the various AAT journals and be available as offprints for the fall of 1961. A list of the editors who are to write the "Programs": AATF, Prof. Richard M. Chadbourne, Univ. of Colorado; Prof. Edward J. Geary, Harvard Univ.; AATG, Prof. Helmut Rehder, Univ. of Texas; Prof. Otto Springer, Univ. of Pennsylvania; AATI, Prof. Carlo Golino, UCLA; Prof. Olga M. Ragusa, Columbia Univ.; AATSEEL, Prof. Horace Gray Lunt II, Harvard Univ.; Prof. Leon I. Twarog, Boston Univ.; AATSP, Prof. Gardiner H. London, Univ. of Connecticut; Prof. Robert G. Mead, Jr., Univ. of Connecticut.

Language Laboratory Conference

The Language Laboratory Conference was arranged at Indiana University on January 22-23, 1960, for discussing theoretical

and practical problems in audio-visual teaching of foreign languages, centered around the language laboratory. The aim of the conference was to bring together a group of outstanding experts in this field — linguists, psychologists, and language teachers — and to have them pass their experience on to fellow-teachers and administrators. The total number of speakers, discussants, and demonstrators was 25. The total number of participants was about 500. They represented 95 colleges and universities, 87 high schools, and 33 other institutions. The conference was held under the auspices of the Language Planning Committee, administrators of a grant made by the Ford Foundation to Indiana University for exploring means of developing and improving foreign language instruction. The Conference materials are presently being prepared for publication.

Forthcoming 1960 AATSEEL Annual Meeting

The 1960 AATSEEL Annual Meeting will be held in the Sylvania Hotel, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on December 27 and 28, 1960. Professor Roman Jakobson, Harvard University, will be the speaker at the AATSEEL dinner there on the evening of December 28.

Members wishing to read papers there are reminded that they should send their manuscripts, no later than August 15, to the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Professor Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. Programs will be sent out in advance of the meeting to AATSEEL members, and will also be published in the MLA Program Bulletin.

Studies on Russian Intelligentsia

Daedalus, Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, will publish in June 1960 a special issue on the Russian Intelligentsia. In addition to articles on the Pre-Revolutionary Intelligentsia, there will be articles on the Soviet Intelligentsia, Comparative Essays, and Documents, including "'Dr. Zhivago': Letter to Boris Pasternak from the Editors of Novy Mir." Richard Pipes is Guest Editor of this issue.

AATSEEL OFFICERS, 1959 (continued from inside front cover)

II. Chapter Officers (cont.)

Michigan Chapter

President: Nikolai P. Poltoratzky, Michigan State Univ.
Vice President: Ida Paper, Redford High School, Detroit
Secretary-Treasurer: Horace W. Dewey, Univ. of Michigan

New England Chapter

President: Valerie Tumins, Brown Univ.
Secretary-Treasurer: Joachim Baer, Harvard Univ.

New York - New Jersey Regional Chapter

President: Albert Parry, Colgate Univ.
Vice Presidents: Ludmilla B. Turkevich, Princeton Univ.
and Douglass Coll.
Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar Coll.
Nicholas Pervouchine, United Nations
Secretary-Treasurer: Olga S. Fedoroff, Syracuse Univ.
AFIT Language Program

North Dakota Chapter

President: Norman Balfour Levin, Univ. of North Dakota
Vice President: Nicholas Kohanowski, Univ. of North
Dakota
Secretary-Treasurer: Sister Dolores Berry, St. Mary's
School, Grand Forks

Ohio Chapter

President: Morton Benson, Ohio Univ. (Athens)
Secretary-Treasurer: Frank Silbajoris, Oberlin Coll.

Oregon Chapter

President: Mrs. Vera Krivoshein, Reed Coll.
Vice Presidents: R. E. Steussy, Univ. of Oregon
Loretta Wollett, Cleveland High School,
Portland
Secretary-Treasurer: Marvin E. Weinberger, Reed Coll.

Pennsylvania Chapter

President: Anthony Salys, Univ. of Pennsylvania
Vice President: Anna Pirszenok, Univ. of Pennsylvania
Secretary-Treasurer: William Langebartel, Temple Univ.

Rhode Island Chapter

President: Valerie Tumins, Brown Univ.
Secretary-Treasurer: Chester Kisiel, Cranston High School

Texas Chapter

President: Eduard Miček, Univ. of Texas
Vice President: M. I. Smith, Univ. of Texas
Secretary-Treasurer: Joe Malik, Jr., Univ. of Texas

Washington Chapter

President: Lew R. Mickleson, Univ. of Washington
Vice President: Noah D. Gershevsky, Univ. of Washington
Secretary-Treasurer: Laurence C. Thompson, Univ. of
Washington

III. Committee for the Promotion of Russian and Other East
European Languages in the American Secondary School

Chairman: Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington Univ.

RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES

Russian and East European Institute
Indiana University

Thomas A. Sebeok, *Editor*; Robert F. Byrnes, William B. Edgerton, Norman J. G. Pounds, Nicolas Spulber, and Robert C. Tucker, *Associate Editors*

VOLUMES IN PRINT

- | | | |
|--------|---|--------|
| No. 1 | Eeva K. Minn, <i>Studies in Cheremis</i> , Vol. 4, <i>Derivation</i> (1956). | \$2.00 |
| No. 2 | Michael Ginsburg and Joseph T. Shaw, Eds., <i>Indiana Slavic Studies</i> , Vol. 1 (1956). | \$3.00 |
| No. 3 | Piotr S. Wandycz, <i>Czechoslovak-Polish Confederation</i> (1956). | \$2.50 |
| No. 4 | Norman J. G. Pounds and Nicolas Spulber, Eds., <i>Resources and Planning in Eastern Europe</i> (1957). | \$2.50 |
| No. 7 | Mark V. Vishniak, "Sovremennye Zapiski"— <i>Memoirs of the Editor</i> (1957). (In Russian.) | \$4.00 |
| No. 10 | Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, <i>The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1957</i> (1958). | \$2.00 |
| No. 11 | Norman J. G. Pounds, <i>The Upper Silesian Industrial Region</i> (1958). | \$4.00 |
| No. 12 | Robert F. Byrnes, <i>Bibliography of American Publications on East Central Europe, 1945-1957</i> (1958). | \$2.50 |
| No. 14 | Vaclav L. Benes, Robert F. Byrnes, and Nicolas Spulber, Eds., <i>The Second Soviet-Yugoslav Dispute</i> (Full text of main documents) (1959). | \$3.50 |
| No. 15 | Robert F. Byrnes, Ed., <i>The Non-Western Areas in Undergraduate Education in Indiana</i> (1959). | \$2.00 |
| No. 16 | Paul L. Horecky, <i>Libraries and Bibliographic Centers in the Soviet Union</i> (1959). (Cloth bound, \$6.00.) | \$3.00 |
| No. 17 | Barbara Jelavich, <i>Russia and the Rumanian National Cause (1858-1859)</i> (1959). | \$4.00 |
| No. 18 | Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, <i>The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1958</i> (1959). | \$2.00 |
| No. 19 | Boris I. Gorokhoff, <i>Publishing in the U.S.S.R.</i> (1959). (Cloth bound, \$6.00.) | \$3.00 |
| No. 20 | Avrahm Yarmolinsky, <i>Literature Under Communism: the Literary Policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union from the End of World War II to the Death of Stalin</i> (1960). | \$4.00 |

Volumes in Preparation

- | | |
|--------|---|
| No. 21 | Joseph T. Shaw, Ed., with others, <i>The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1959</i> . |
| No. 22 | Marvin Rintala, <i>Three Generations: The Extreme Right Wing in Finnish Politics</i> . |
| No. 23 | M. Dragomanov, <i>Notes on the Slavic Religio-Ethical Legends: The Dualistic Creation of the World</i> . (Trans. by Earl W. Count.) |
- Lilien's *English-Polish Dictionary* is now distributed in connection with this Series. Fascicles 1-19 are available at \$1.50 each.

All correspondence should be addressed to the

EDITOR, RUSSIAN AND EAST EUROPEAN SERIES
RAYL HOUSE, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA